

POSITORY

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE
UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 28, 1957

PART 55

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1957

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

OCT 9 - 1957

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina
MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska

ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*
J. G. SOURWINE, *Associate Counsel*
WILLIAM A. RUSHER, *Associate Counsel*
BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Anslinger, Harry J-----	3611
Caldwell, John C-----	3633
Tennien, Fr. Mark-----	3624

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1957

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER
INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:35 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator Roman L. Hruska presiding.

Present: Senators Hruska and Jenner.

Also present: Jay Sourwine, associate counsel; and F. W. Schroeder, investigator.

Senator HRUSKA. The committee will come to order.

We are concerned this morning with making inquiry into the conditions and activities in Red China, and have called several witnesses for the purpose of testifying in that respect.

The first witness will be Mr. Anslinger. Is he here?

Will you be sworn, please, Mr. Anslinger? Raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the testimony you are about to give, so help you God?

Mr. ANSLINGER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HARRY J. ANSLINGER, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF NARCOTICS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Senator HRUSKA. Give your name and address to the reporter, please.

Mr. ANSLINGER. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, Washington.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you a prepared statement, Mr. Anslinger?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I have copies here of testimony that I am going to give if you would like to follow it. It comes in three parts.

Senator HRUSKA. Very well. You may proceed with it.

Mr. ANSLINGER. Well, the first document that I want to present is the report of the Committee on Illicit Traffic of the United Nations. This is dated April 28, 1956. This is fairly recent.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you connected with that committee?

Mr. ANSLINGER. I am Vice Chairman of the Commission.¹

Senator HRUSKA. How long have you served in that capacity?

¹ UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., April 29 (INS).—United States Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger today was unanimously elected chairman of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs.—Washington Post, April 30, 1957.

Mr. ANSLINGER. Well, I have been the United States representative on that Commission since 1946 and I have at different times presented evidence, I believe beginning about 1952, about this situation in Red China. It has all been presented to the committee before,² but now this is entirely new. This is all evidence in addition to that which I had presented before.

These are the excerpts that have particular relation to the situation as it affects the mainland of China. I tried to condense this as much as possible, but the Commission in this report went to the Economic and Social Council.

Now, the Commission decided that the heaviest traffic, as in previous years, centered in the Far East. That is in relation to all illicit traffic in narcotic drugs. That would be opium, heroin, morphine; heroin being the deadliest drug.

Now, the Commission was informed by the representatives of the United Kingdom that, owing to the geographical position of the territory, there was a heavy traffic flowing through Hong Kong, particularly in opium and opiates.

Now, the opiates were crude morphine and heroin. As in the past, the traffic seemed to be concentrated in the Far East, and the Commission viewed with concern the very heavy traffic in the Far East, and particularly noted that a quantity of 35,000 kilos of raw opium had been seized in Thailand.

Now, that is 35 tons, which is a tremendous quantity of opium. The heaviest seizures were made in Thailand.

Senator HRUSKA. Who made the seizures?

Mr. ANSLINGER. The Government of Thailand made the seizures.

Now, the representative of the United Kingdom drew the Commission's attention to the very difficult problems of control facing the Federation of Malaya, Hong Kong, and Singapore. He said that there was an appalling illicit traffic situation in these territories and their resources were being strained to the utmost in trying to deal with this problem.

Then he goes on to say that in Malaya, a young country nearing independence, the government has to deal with many problems and this just adds to the problems. In fact, the Chief Minister of the Federation, on a recent visit to the United Kingdom, found it necessary to emphasize the extent of the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs.

In respect of Hong Kong, the growing use of commercial aircraft by traffickers was noticeable and, apart from the opium that passed through the colony for consumption as such, it was suspected that much of it was earmarked for transformation into crude morphine or diacetylmorphine, which is heroin.

The British authorities there have uncovered some illicit factories which are processing crude morphine into heroin.

The Government of the United Kingdom was gravely disturbed at the movement of opium from the interior of Asia, which means Communist China, through Thailand, which had greatly aggravated the illicit traffic in these territories, and there would have to be a prolonged and concentrated effort to curb this traffic by the Government of Thailand, but it was facing great difficulties.

² See Communist China and Illicit Narcotic Traffic, pp. 1-14.

Then we go on to morphine base and crude morphine. That is a derivative of raw opium from which heroin is made, and here we find, insofar as that traffic throughout the world goes, the most significant feature was the existence of clandestine manufacture in the Far East, and the Government of Thailand seized 81 kilograms of morphine hydrochloride. That is a new development in the Far East, and there was considerable traffic in the drug originated in the Far East beyond the frontier in the northernmost part of the country. That is the Commission's way of saying it came from Communist China.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say it is a new development. You mean it is a new development that that particular drug is being made out there?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Yes, sir. Because heretofore this illicit traffic in morphine was centered more in the Near East and in Europe. In the view of some countries it was traffic in the drug from the mainland through Hong Kong, Macao, to Thailand, that is, Formosa and Japan. Japan has suffered particularly from the influx of heroin from Communist China and, of course, we have at different times reported the mainland of China as the source of heroin seized in this country and later on I shall give you a report on a development just 2 weeks ago in relation to that.

The Commission considered the emergence of this heavy traffic in morphine which has just begun as one of the most sinister developments in recent years. I would like the committee to realize that these reports are adopted after debate and opposition and with 15 countries, particularly the Iron Curtain countries objecting, it is, I think, rather remarkable that this kind of a report comes out.

Senator HRUSKA. On what kind of basis do they object to the reports?

Mr. ANSLINGER. They object on the basis that it is slander and untrue, and so on, and they attempt to have some of these items stricken from the report, but we maintain that these are reports of sovereign governments and they are entitled to recognition just the same as their own reports.

Senator HRUSKA. Is the report of the Commission based on government reports?

Mr. ANSLINGER. It is based strictly on government reports.

Senator HRUSKA. From the governments involved.

Mr. ANSLINGER. From the governments involved, yes, sir, and they are only included when—the details are only put in there if there is proof, if the governments can show proof that these things happen.

Now, here is the Government of Thailand which shows also this crude morphine traffic originating again in the forests beyond the frontier in the northernmost part of the country and, as the observer for Thailand indicated, his Government had received scant cooperation from the neighboring countries in the region.

Despite the unhappy and desperate situation, he expressed the Government's determination to continue its struggle and, of course, as usual, we express—the Commission, rather, expressed its sympathy with the difficult situation facing Thailand and wished to stress that the situation was one of serious danger to the international community.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the full text of this excerpted report be put in the record at this point?

Senator HRUSKA. It will go in the record at this point.

(The report referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 439" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 439

**UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS—
ELEVENTH SESSION**

ILLEGIT TRAFFIC

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ILLEGIT TRAFFIC

(P. 4)

4. The heaviest traffic as in previous years centred in the Far East * * *. The Commission was informed by the representative of the United Kingdom that, owing to the geographical position of the territory, there was a heavy traffic flowing through Hong Kong, particularly in opium and opiates * * *.

(Pp. 5-6)

Raw opium

10. As in the past, the traffic seemed to be concentrated in the Far East * * *. The Commission viewed with concern the very heavy traffic in the Far East and particularly noted that a quantity of 35,524 kg. of raw opium had been seized in Thailand * * *.

11. The representative of the United Kingdom drew the Commission's attention to the very difficult problems of control facing the Federation of Malaya, Hong Kong, and Singapore. There was an appalling illicit traffic situation in these territories, and their resources were being strained to the utmost in trying to deal with this problem. The regular flow of opium and other drugs by land, sea, and air towards and through territories, and the significant quantities in individual seizures would seem to indicate the existence of a well-organized traffic. In Malaya, a young country nearing independence, the Government had to deal with many problems resulting not merely from the country's new status but also from the aftermath of war, occupation, and rebellion. The seriousness of the drug problem there might be judged from the fact that, despite the gravity of his other preoccupations, the Chief Minister of the Federation, on a recent visit to the United Kingdom, had thought it necessary to emphasize the extent of the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs * * *. In respect of Hong Kong, the growing use of commercial aircraft by traffickers was noticeable and, apart from the opium that passed through the colony for consumption as such, it was suspected that much of it was earmarked for transformation into crude morphine or diacetylmorphine (heroin) * * *.

12. The Government of the United Kingdom were gravely disturbed at the movement of opium from the interior of Asia through Thailand, which had greatly aggravated the illicit traffic in these territories * * *. There could be no doubt that a prolonged and concentrated effort to curb this traffic would have to be made by the Government of Thailand in the face of great difficulties.

(P. 10)

Morphine base and crude morphine

23. The Commission felt grave concern at the striking increase in seizures of morphine base and crude morphine hydrochloride as compared with 1954. The most significant feature of the traffic was the existence of clandestine manufacture in both the Far East and the Near and Middle East * * *.

24. The Commission noted that the Government of Thailand had reported 81,888 kg. of crude morphine hydrochloride. The observer of Thailand emphasized that there was no clandestine manufacture of crude morphine in Thailand itself. However, there was a considerable traffic in the drug originating in the forests beyond the frontier in the northernmost part of the country. * * * A small part of the contraband was for illicit domestic consumption, but most of it was destined for illicit export to Singapore and Hong Kong.

(P. 11)

Diacetylmorphine (heroin)

30. In the view of some countries, there was traffic in the drug from the mainland of China through Hong Kong and Macao to China (Taiwan) and Japan. The mainland of China was also reported as one of the main sources of diacetylmorphine for the United States of America * * *.

32. North America continued to be the destination of much of the more highly organized traffic in this drug * * *.

(P. 18-19)

Thailand

56. The Commission took a grave view of the situation in Thailand which, if anything, was more sombre than that reported last year. It noted that the Government of Thailand had reported very heavy seizures of opium and crude morphine. The Commission considered the emergence of a heavy traffic in morphine as one of the most sinister developments in recent years.

57-58. The observer of Thailand stated * * *. The bulk of the opium seized came over the northern land frontiers of Thailand and the presence of armed bands in that region who were using opium to defray their expenses had further complicated the situation. This traffic found a market, to some extent, within Thailand itself, but much of it was also destined for export to places such as Singapore, Federation of Malaya, and Hong Kong.

59. * * * there was a considerable traffic in crude morphine hydrochloride originating in the forests at the frontier in the northernmost part of the country. The drug was being smuggled through Chiengrai to Bangkok by highway and railroad. A small part of it was for illicit domestic consumption, but most of it was destined for illicit export to Singapore and Hong Kong.

60. * * * His country had received scant cooperation from the neighbouring countries in the common struggle against the illicit traffic * * *. However, he felt that international cooperation to curb the flow of narcotic drugs over the northern frontiers of Thailand was urgently needed. Despite an unhappy and desperate situation, he expressed his Government's determination to continue its struggle against the illicit traffic.

62. The Commission expressed its sympathy with the difficult position facing that country. It wished to stress that the situation there was one of serious danger to the international community.

Senator HRUSKA. Before you leave that section of the report, Mr. Anslinger, these seizures to which you refer in the one instance of some 35,000 kilos and the other of 81,000, is that a sum total of the seizures that were made from time to time?

Mr. ANSLINGER. In Thailand, itself, and that would be over a period of 1 year.

Senator HRUSKA. How would that compare with seizures for the preceding year or any other comparable period?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Much larger than before, an increase in traffic.

Senator HRUSKA. And are they being seized—these seizures, do they occur at various places within the country or are they concentrated in one area?

Mr. ANSLINGER. They are seized all over the country. Most of the seizures take place up on the border. I will develop that in the next document here, which I have prepared, and this is information and evidence which is subsequent to this report. What I am trying to give you now is not included in the report of the Commission, but will be considered by the Commission at its next session in a short time.

Mr. SOURWINE. This is your own report?

Mr. ANSLINGER. This is my own report, which I will use as a basis for discussion at the next meeting of the United Nations.

Senator HRUSKA. Very well. You may proceed, Mr. Anslinger.

Mr. ANSLINGER. Well, I have called to the attention of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs on several occasions the enor-

mous illicit traffic in narcotic drugs flowing out from the Chinese mainland to many countries in the world, and at the present time we are able to bring the traffic originating in Communist China into focus more clearly than ever before by noting the seizures and enforcement conditions in countries directly affected by the overwhelming supply of illicit narcotics from this greatest source.

In the United States, the availability of heroin from this source is felt and is a matter of concern. However, in this country we are showing improvement largely through the increased effectiveness of the weapons given us by the last Congress, and this most important weapon is the 5-year penalty for the sale of illicit drugs, and that applies whether it is far removed from the Communist source, without suspension of sentence, probation, or parole, and that has discouraged a number of potential sellers who have withdrawn from the traffic, but it is a great weapon, which I point out to you later on in a specific case just a few weeks ago.

Enforcement conditions in other countries are such that these countries face the continuing deluge of narcotics from Red China only with great difficulty and with the danger of being overwhelmed, and I pointed out in this report here, the same as the Commission did, about Malaya, this new country just on the eve of independence, having this great problem in addition to the many others that they are faced with.

The real fact is that a constant and increasing supply of opium from Yunnan—that is the southern Province [of China] from where most of this comes. I won't say all, but over 50 percent, comes out of Yunnan. In Malaya, harassed by the opium from Red China, 746 pounds were seized in the first months of 1956. That is very substantial when you figure that enforcement officers, if they seize as much as 20 percent, feel very fortunate.

Now, in Singapore, where the Government, the United Kingdom, the Government of Great Britain, had abolished all the opium smoking monopolies in Singapore right after the last war—but here in a 6-month period in 1956, over 3,000 pounds of opium were seized in one 3-month period, 78 percent of the seized opium could be traced to the Yunnan area of Red China, and the authorities there are extending every effort to combat the traffic as shown by 1,722 raids during that 6-month period. And many of these seizures here in lots of 200 to 305 pounds—there is 1 seizure of 305 pounds that was of the Crown brand, and the Chinese inscription on the wrapping stated:

Yunnan genuine quality packing; always look for the Crown trademark.
Customers please beware of imitation.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Anslinger, maybe you are going to deal with it later in your statement, and if you do, I don't want to disrupt the sequence of your testimony, but is there anything to indicate that the traffic in these narcotics is a policy of the Red Chinese Government? Is it an activity that is approved and it is, perhaps, even encouraged, or certainly tolerated?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Well, from what we can see at this end of the line, we don't see anything being done by that government to discourage this traffic because it is increasing, and we have started on this campaign to try to get them to do something since 1952, and all we see is an increase. So we just have to draw our own conclusions as to whether they are even attempting to suppress this traffic.

They are probably suppressing the traffic within the country, but certainly, insofar as these exports go, which give them gold, probably one of the only ways they have of getting more gold, is through this traffic.

Senator HRUSKA. Do their own laws proscribe the use of drugs within their borders in Red China?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Oh, yes; they do. Their own laws prohibit the cultivation of opium and all this comes from opium. There must be vast areas of opium poppy grown.

Now, when the Nationalist Government, when they had the enforcement of this act, which was taken over by the new government, there were a thousand executions a year for smugglers and traffickers, and I haven't heard of anybody being shot in China for trafficking in narcotics, but certainly, the Nationalist Government of China had taken such repressive measures that they had almost brought the situation to a standstill, and that is why we commenced to find traffic originating in Mexico and in the Middle East, traffic increased there.

Now, with the pressure off in China, the Nationalist Government being out, this traffic resumed. Now, naturally, we take a lot of abuse from the Russian delegates and from the Polish delegates, but all they can do is to cry slander, and when this report reaches the Peiping Government, all they do is usually attack me personally or just say that it is slander.

There is nothing to it and you just get a denial. If they would only reply through their Russian friends, point by point to these seizures and show if they could offset some of this, but that is all you get, just vilification and abuse.

Senator HRUSKA. You have indicated that this traffic seems to be on an export basis from Red China.

Mr. ANSLINGER. Yes, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. And presumably the incentive there is the supply of gold that it brings back in. Now, is there anything in your investigations, or in the facts brought to you which would indicate that the Red Chinese government itself is participating in the profits of that traffic?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Well, I submitted documentation on that at the United Nations, I think in about 1952 and 1953. I haven't had anything since that time, but I did show where the bureau was located, a government bureau that collected the revenue from this.

Senator HRUSKA. From this traffic?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Yes, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. You have made no inquiries since that investigation that you made at that time?

Mr. ANSLINGER. No, because we haven't any indication that that isn't the fact now, because it evidently is just a continuing—it must be a continuing organization because, certainly, this large traffic could not go on without government approval. Certainly, they have been able to stop this sort of traffic in other countries.

Here is the Government of Iran today which has ordered complete suppression of the opium poppy, complete prohibition of consumption, and they are doing a magnificent job. The Red Chinese would be able to do that themselves if they tried.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you something, Mr. Sourwine? You started to speak a little bit ago, and I interrupted you.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Senator covered the point.

Mr. ANSLINGER. Now, I am coming to that border situation in Burma and the Burmese Government is trying to do everything possible to put an end to this traffic, but here they are with 360 seizures smuggled into Burma by land from China, and again, in 1955 with regard to the smuggling of opium by land, there were 500 seizures in the Bharmo district. That is the recent penetration of Communists down into Burma. That is the district; 500 seizures, which means, according to our calculations there were probably 7,000 sorties of smugglers down in that particular district.

And here we have 562 pounds seized near Mandalay. In August, 3 seizures at Kengtung totaling 3,000 pounds. That is a city of northern Burma and that is the hub through which most of the opium passes which is destined for southeast Asia from Red China.

The officials are quite alert, but they are facing a terrific problem.

Now, we have Hong Kong and Japan which continue to be way-stations through which heroin from Red China is reaching the United States. Right after the last war there was not one heroin addict in Japan, and I suppose today they have as many as we have, and a lot of that trafficking is in the hands of the Communists, members of the Communist Party. In one place in northern Japan, actually the head of the Communist Party was peddling the stuff for, as he said, funds to take care of the party's activities.

In September 1956 a trafficker here, Leon King, was arrested in Japan after he had shipped several pounds of heroin to the United States which was obtained in China. Here is a seizure which reached Hong Kong from Bangkok, the origin, of course, being Red China, 244 pounds. Here is 31 pounds of morphine. There was another large seizure which went by plane from Bangkok over to London, some 40 pounds, and in Ceylon they are having difficulty.

In February of 1956 the arrest of a Chinese in San Francisco and the seizure of 1 pound of heroin uncovered an organized group of traffickers dealing in heroin from Red China for 3 years. Members of the group included two merchant seamen couriers on crack American passenger liners, and the leader was John Watson, a tavern operator in Hong Kong with connections in Communist China.

In Vietnam illicit opium from Red China is reaching Saigon in half-ton lots.

Mr. SOURWINE. Commissioner, you mentioned Ceylon. Your figures would appear to show a tremendous percentage increase from 1954 to 1955 in Ceylon, actually, 400 to 1.

Mr. ANSLINGER. The increase there is rather startling.

Senator HRUSKA. Would it be apt to be a more vigilant followup by the Ceylon authorities or would it indicate a greater volume of imports?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Sir, it is both, because with this tremendous traffic increasing, they must become more alert and be on their toes to meet this problem, and that is the situation all through southeast Asia with enforcement officers. Some of the enforcement officers have been to our school here, which was set up under the recent act of Congress, and we are lending a helping hand wherever we can, but it is a very difficult proposition.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Anslinger, I think it would be a fair conclusion on the basis of what you have said here, that there seems to

have been a great stepup in the production and in the export of these drugs from Red China. Now, what motives would they have? What would you say the motives are? You have already given one, and that is gold. That is a pretty universal incentive, but have they any other motives besides that?

Mr. ANSLINGER. We have felt certainly in the Far East in relation to, for instance, our personnel there, our troops, that it has done damage there. However, the Army has just about cleaned that situation up. They have done a remarkable job in keeping our enlisted people away from there.

Senator HRUSKA. You mean the American troops that may be stationed there?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Yes, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. Stationed at any of those points accessible to these points of export?

Mr. ANSLINGER. That is right; yes, sir.

I pointed out, for instance, in South Korea the local police there had arrested 2,400 young agents who came down with heroin in one hand and gold in the other and were trying to corrupt our people there.

Senator HRUSKA. Whose agents were they?

Mr. ANSLINGER. They were Communist agents, had been trained in a Communist school in Rashin. They are all young people.

Now, if they arrested 2,400, you can imagine how many more were on the loose there with their efforts to corrupt troops or corrupt the civilians.

In answering your question directly, sir, I think that anyone who sells poison to his fellow man knows exactly what he is doing. He is trying to destroy him.

Senator HRUSKA. What measures is the United Nations taking on this whole subject, not only on this subject in general, but on account of this increase, this new impetus which it seems to have gained?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Well, sir, we have been trying to coordinate the efforts of the southeast Asia enforcement personnel and invite them to every meeting where this matter is discussed so they can see the whole picture.

Now, the United Nations is not operational and naturally they can't go out and make these investigations. They have to depend on the local authorities for their reports. That is on the one hand. Now, on the other hand, for instance, this matter of synthetic narcotic drugs is becoming tremendously increasing throughout the world, and here the United Nations has done a wonderful job of controlling it. So far, these synthetic drugs have not been able to get into this traffic through United Nations control, through a system of import and export certificates and watching the limitation of manufacture, getting the estimates of all these countries.

But, what I think the United Nations can do more than anything is to bring world opinion to bear on this, and that is just about our best weapon, sir. World opinion certainly is about the only thing that is effective here.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do these synthetics originate in Communist or non-Communist countries?

Mr. ANSLINGER. No; they have not appeared yet in Communist China.

Mr. SOURWINE. In other words, the United Nations is able to exert some moral force which controls these synthetics which originate in non-Communist countries, but it is unable to exert such moral force to control the narcotics which originate in Communist China.

Mr. ANSLINGER. That is a correct statement, sir.

Now, this final document which I have here, which is just something—

Mr. SOURWINE. May I interrupt? May I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the full text of the statement entitled "Red China and the Narcotic Traffic, 1956," concerning which the witness has testified, be put in the record at this point?

Senator HIRSKA. It will be received.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 440" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 440

RED CHINA AND THE NARCOTIC TRAFFIC, 1956

I have called to the attention of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs on several occasions the enormous illicit traffic in narcotic drugs pouring out from the Chinese mainland to many countries of the world. At the present time we are able to bring the traffic originating in Communist China into focus more clearly than ever before by noting the seizures and enforcement conditions in countries directly affected by the overwhelming supply of illicit narcotics from this greatest source. In the United States the availability of heroin from this source is felt and is a matter of concern. However, in this country we are showing some improvement, largely through the increased effectiveness of the weapons given us by the Congress. The most potent of these weapons is the minimum 5-year penalty for illicit sale without any suspension of sentence, probation or parole. This has already discouraged a number of potential sellers who have withdrawn from the traffic.

Enforcement conditions in other countries are such that these countries face the continuing deluge of narcotics from Red China only with great difficulty and with the danger of being overwhelmed. One of these countries, the Federation of Malayan States, has banned the smoking of opium and has waged relentless war against the traffickers with every resource available. They have made great progress, but are faced with the very real fact that a constant and increasing supply of opium from Yunnan and other neighboring Provinces of Red China makes enforcement very difficult. In Malaya, harassed by the opium from Red China, 746 pounds of opium were seized during the first 6 months of 1956.

In Singapore an additional 3,364 pounds of opium were seized during the same period. In one 3-month period, 78 percent of the seized opium could be traced to the Yunnan area of Red China. The authorities are extending every effort to combat the traffic as shown by the 1,722 raids on smoking opium dens made during the same 6 months. Many seizures of opium are made in lots from 200 to 300 pounds. One seizure of 305 pounds was of the Crown brand and the Chinese inscription on the wrapping stated, "Yunnan genuine quality packing. Always look for the 'Crown' trademark. Customers please beware of imitation." This transit point in world shipping is one of the principal points through which heroin, morphine, and opium flow out of Red China.

Late seizures indicate the traffic through Burma from Red China has increased although the Government of Burma reported in 1954, "There were 360 seizures of opium smuggled into Burma by land from China," and again in 1955, "with regard to the smuggling of opium by land, there were 500 seizures in the Bhamo District of opium smuggled into Burma from China." Now in 1956 we have the following reported seizures: In July an opium seizure of 562 pounds was made near Mandalay. In August 3 seizures of opium were made in Kengtung totaling 3,010 pounds. Kengtung is a city in northeastern Burma and is the hub through which passes most of the opium destined for southeast Asia from Red China. The seizures show the officials are alert. They also show the terrific problem in this country lying adjacent to Red China.

The production of opium has been prohibited in Thailand since 1949. Several hundred tons of opium from Red China annually are smuggled through Thailand, according to official estimates. This traffic is not limited to opium, since 1

seizure in 1956 included 132 pounds of morphine, a development causing concern to the United Nations.

Hong Kong and Japan continue to be way stations through which heroin from Red China is reaching the United States. In September 1956 a trafficker, Leon King, from Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, was arrested in Japan after he had shipped several pounds of heroin to the United States. The investigation, following his arrest in Tokyo, includes his activities on four trips to Japan by air since the end of 1955 to arrange for shipments of heroin from Hong Kong to Japan to the United States.

One opium seizure which reached Hong Kong from Bangkok (evidently Red China was the source) totaled 244 pounds; 31 pounds of morphine arriving by the same route were seized. In May 1956 one seizure of 200,000 heroin pills and 11 pounds of heroin pill mixture was reported by Hong Kong authorities who estimated the single illicit laboratory raided was turning out batches of 70,000 pills 4 or 5 times a month. The Hong Kong authorities are exerting every effort to cope with the traffic.

In Ceylon 23 pounds of opium were seized during 1954. In 1955 this increased to 1,022 pounds. One seizure alone was 850 pounds and the report from that country states that "this opium seizure has uncovered a big international ring who are using Ceylon as their base to receive and reexport narcotics to various parts of the world."

In February 1956 the arrest of a Chinese in San Francisco and the seizure of 1 pound of heroin uncovered an organized group of traffickers dealing in heroin from Red China for 3 years. Members of the group included two merchant seamen couriers on crack American passenger liners, and the leader and brains of the conspiracy, John M. Watson, a tavern operator in Hong Kong with connections in Communist China.

In Vietnam illicit opium from Red China is reaching Saigon in half-ton lots. Communists maintain control of the sale of the opium whenever possible so that they obtain the major part of the profits.

MR. ANSLINGER. This is something that just happened a few weeks ago and I think, sir, this is right to the point, right to the point of your inquiry.

The flow of heroin from Red China continues to find its way to the United States through our west coast ports, as aptly illustrated by a recent investigation completed by our San Francisco office.

For a number of years George Douglas Poole was suspected of being the ringleader of a group of merchant seamen engaged in smuggling enormous quantities of heroin of Communist Chinese origin from the Far East to the United States. The scope of this smuggling activity was not fully appreciated until the story of their conspiracy unfolded in testimony given by two members of the ring, William and Thomas Moeller.

The testimony of these two members of the group was obtained only through the use of a new and most potent enforcement aid recently given by the Congress—the immunity-of-witness provision of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956. In addition to the 5-year minimum penalty, that is our strongest weapon today, as you will see from the events that followed here.

The heroin smuggling of this group began in 1948 and continued through 1956. Some 33 persons were involved. The smuggling venture was started in 1948 by Anthony J. Longobardi, James Wood, and Gerald Williams, all merchant seamen. New members joined the ring and the tempo of their smuggling increased under the leadership of George D. Poole, who had joined the group shortly after its inception.

The smuggling method of this group hinged on the fact that the majority were merchant seamen, shipping out from San Francisco to ports of the Orient.

Prior to the time one of the ring was due to sail, members of the group placed equal amounts of money in a pool for the proposed purchase. The member acting as courier met the heroin source in Hong Kong and received delivery.

During its operation the ring had access to three separate sources of this Communist Chinese heroin. These mysterious suppliers were known to the smuggling group only as Abdul, Calli, and Goldteeth. The quantities of heroin smuggled on each trip usually involved several kilograms. A kilogram would be over 32 ounces and on the illicit market at the retail level, an ounce would be worth about \$3,000 or 100 times its weight in gold.

After obtaining delivery in Hong Kong, the courier returned to the ship and hid the contraband until the vessel cleared the last port of call, Honolulu. The heroin was then removed from its place of concealment and sewed to the inner lining of a parka, a jacket commonly worn by seamen.

When the vessel arrived in San Francisco Harbor, King S. Richardson, longshoreman and member of the gang, would board the vessel in the bay along with other longshoremen. While the ship was preparing to dock, Richardson would exchange the parka he was wearing for the parka containing the heroin and would eventually leave the vessel unmolested and free from search, carrying the heroin.

The heroin was then distributed by the ring in wholesale quantities to dealers along the west coast. From time to time members of the ring would hold meetings to split the proceeds and arrange for additional heroin shipments.

The quantity of heroin smuggled into the United States by this ring alone—and we are working on several other rings as a result of this immunity provision—has been estimated at 70 kilograms.

Senator HRUSKA. Over what period of time?

Mr. ANSLINGER. I think from 1948. This one small group, until we took care of them the other day—from 1948 to 1956.

Now, 70 kilograms of heroin is a tremendous quantity. We wouldn't seize that much heroin in a year in the United States. And when you get down to the retail level, the value goes into astronomical figures.

A Federal grand jury in San Francisco currently hearing this matter has already returned indictments against nine of the most important members of the ring, and other indictments are expected shortly. We have in the past also done work of this kind without the benefit of the immunity statute, and we indicted Juda Ezrin in Hong Kong, one of the big ringleaders who has a reputation for controlling heroin traffic out of Communist China. We were able to convict all the ringleaders in San Francisco, but we could not get hold of Ezrin.

Senator HRUSKA. That 70 kilograms, is that what the quantity was over a period of 8 years?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Yes, by this small group of seamen.

Senator HRUSKA. However, there would be no way of determining, then, the impact, if any, of this increased emphasis within Red China itself as you earlier described as being exported to neighboring countries?

Mr. ANSLINGER. No. The activities of this small ring would not indicate that, but we certainly have seen the increase in the amount of heroin coming into the west coast from Communist China.

Senator HRUSKA. Not on the basis of this one estimate but—

Mr. ANSLINGER. Not on the basis—

Senator HRUSKA. But projected into the entire picture, you probably would have some grounds for drawing a conclusion; is that right?

Mr. ANSLINGER. That is correct, and from the seizure reports that have reached the United Nations up to this time, I can see already that we will be very much disturbed at the increase over last year.

Mr. SOURWINE. I would like to ask just one question.

Senator HRUSKA. Before you do that, there will be included in the record at this point, the full text of this memorandum on George Douglas Poole and others.

(The memorandum referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 441" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 441

GEORGE DOUGLAS POOLE ET AL.

The flow of heroin from Red China continues to find its way to the United States through our west coast ports, as aptly illustrated by a recent investigation completed by the San Francisco office of the Bureau of Narcotics.

For a number of years George Douglas Poole was suspected of being the ring-leader of a group of merchant seamen engaged in smuggling enormous quantities of heroin of Communist Chinese origin from the Far East to the United States. The scope of this smuggling activity was not fully appreciated until the story of their conspiracy unfolded in testimony given by two members of the ring, William and Thomas Moeller.

The testimony of these two members of the group was obtained only through the use of a new and most potent enforcement aid recently given us by Congress—the immunity-of-witness provision of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956.

The heroin smuggling of this group began in 1948 and continued through 1956. Some 33 persons were involved.

The smuggling venture was started in 1948 by Anthony J. Longobardi, James C. Wood and Gerald F. Williams, all merchant seamen. New members joined the ring, and the tempo of their smuggling increased under the leadership of George D. Poole, who had joined the group shortly after its inception.

The smuggling method of this group hinged on the fact that the majority were merchant seamen, shipping out from San Francisco to ports of the Orient.

Prior to the time one of the ring was due to sail, members of the group placed equal amounts of money in a pool for the proposed purchase. The member acting as courier met the heroin source in Hong Kong and received delivery.

During its operation the ring had access to three separate sources of this Communist Chinese heroin. These mysterious suppliers were known to the smuggling group only as Abdul, Calli, and Goldteeth.

The quantities of heroin smuggled on each trip usually involved several kilograms.

After obtaining delivery in Hong Kong, the courier returned to the ship and hid the contraband until the vessel cleared the last port of call, Honolulu. The heroin was then removed from its place of concealment and sewed to the inner lining of a parka, a jacket commonly worn by seamen.

When the vessel arrived in San Francisco harbor, King S. Richardson, longshoreman and member of the gang, would board the vessel in the bay, along with other longshoremen.

While the ship was preparing to dock, Richardson would exchange the parka he was wearing for the parka containing the heroin and would eventually leave the vessel unmolested and free from search, carrying the heroin.

The heroin was then distributed by the ring in wholesale quantities to dealers along the west coast. From time to time members of the ring would hold meetings to split the proceeds and arrange for additional heroin shipments.

The quantity of heroin smuggled into the United States by this ring has been estimated at 70 kilograms. It is believed, however, that this is a conservative figure, and that the actual quantity would greatly exceed that amount, as some of the members of the group were able to establish themselves in business from the proceeds of their heroin smuggling.

A Federal grand jury in San Francisco currently hearing this matter has already returned indictments against nine of the most important members of

the ring, and additional indictments are expected shortly. Also, several members of the ring are already in jail, serving sentences for narcotic violations resulting from this group's activity.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Anslinger, do you have knowledge of the Communist agents as such engaged in expanding the narcotics traffic? You spoke of one Communist leader whom you knew. Are there other instances?

Mr. ANSLINGER. In Japan we do know. We do know that that is a matter of record.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say that makes a pattern, Mr. Anslinger?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Well, I think there is a pattern all through Southeast Asia. Now, we have not seen that in this country except to this extent, that some of these seamen—and I would suppose that these men were a part of the seamen who usually went down to a hall where there are a lot—it was known as a Communist hangout in San Francisco. Seamen who were known to have Communist leanings, that is where they conducted their social activity, their meeting place.

Now, we have not had any case here of a Communist agent as such. We could not identify him as being engaged in the traffic. However, the other people, that is, our other friends in Burma and Thailand and Japan, have had.

Mr. SOURWINE. They have had Communist agents?

Mr. ANSLINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. Summarizing something you said earlier, do I understand you correctly that you have testified that the Nationalist Government of China through enforcement of its own laws had practically altered the export of opium and opium derivatives from China, but under the Red regime it has increased and is increasing periodically?

Mr. ANSLINGER. That is a correct statement, and it is well documented.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Anslinger, for your testimony and for the time that you have taken to be with us.

Our next witness will be Father Tennien.

Will you raise your right hand and be sworn, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Father TENNIEN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF FATHER MARK TENNIEN

Senator HRUSKA. Will you state your name and address for the reporter, please?

Father TENNIEN. Father Mark Tennien, Maryknoll Missions Society. My present address is Maryknoll office, 121 East 29th Street, New York City.

Mr. SOURWINE. Father, just by way of identifying you for the record, you are a native of Pittsford, Vt.

Father TENNIEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You went to school in Montreal, at Holy Cross in Baltimore, and at Maryknoll.

Father TENNIEN. Right.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were ordained in 1927 and you taught at Maryknoll Prep.

Father TENNIEN. Yes, sir, for 1 year.

Mr. SOURWINE. You went to China in 1928.

Father TENNIEN. Correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. In Chungking, during the Second World War, you wrote Chungking Listening Post.

Father TENNIEN. Just at the end of the war, after it was finished. The material, of course, was gathered during the war and assembled and written just at the end of the war, the last few months of the war.

Mr. SOURWINE. You, yourself, were under house arrest for 2 years.

Father TENNIEN. Right.

Mr. SOURWINE. You spent 3 months in a jail cell with about 40 Chinese?

Father TENNIEN. Unfortunately, or fortunately, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You went through the Communist indoctrination course?

Father TENNIEN. Yes. I passed the examinations.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were expelled from China in 1952.

Father TENNIEN. That is right. The beginning.

Mr. SOURWINE. You returned as the director of the China Mission News Service and were stationed in Hong Kong.

Father TENNIEN. Yes; the last 4 years.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were editor of the mission bulletin in Hong Kong from 1953 to 1956?

Father TENNIEN. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. During that time you had an opportunity to interview a great many missionaries who were forced out of China by the Reds.

Father TENNIEN. Yes. Probably 700 or 800, at least, who had gone through indoctrination or imprisonment or who had lived for several years under the Communist regime, and we have had to write that up more or less for history and as a documented report of the things which they had seen so as to have a record of it and a record of events in regard to mission history for the future. That is why I did that.

Senator HRUSKA. And in point of time, when did these interviews occur, Father?

Father TENNIEN. Well, it was more or less intermittent from week to week. Sometimes we would get 10 or 12 a week and sometimes they would go up as high as 25 and 30.

Senator HRUSKA. Over what years?

Father TENNIEN. From the middle of 1952, when I went there, the end of 1952 when I went back, up until last August when I came back from Hong Kong.

Senator HRUSKA. With a total of some 700 or 800.

Father TENNIEN. At least. I haven't totaled them up, but roughly.

Senator HRUSKA. But roughly.

Father TENNIEN. Yes. There were 2,500 Catholic priests thrown out of China and during the first 2 years I was in China with them, and so I interviewed those only after 1952 and during the last 3 years. And I would make a rough estimate that there were probably 700 or 800 priests and Sisters of different foreign nationalities who came out, and I interviewed them and got their story.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are testifying, then, both from your own knowledge of conditions and from what you have learned through these many hundreds of interviews.

Father TENNIEN. Yes; I think this could be called a confirmation of what I had seen, and it rather backs up the theories and conclusions that I had come to about communism myself because they are pretty much unanimous and pretty much the same of all the men who have come out.

Mr. SOURWINE. Father Tennien, would you say that the Red enslavement of China is complete?

Father TENNIEN. Temporarily it is effective. I don't know whether you would call it complete or not, because in order to be complete enslavement, you would have to silence every voice and squash every contrary opinion and, of course, that is humanly impossible.

There is a, what would you call it, an opposing opinion, although it isn't very vociferous. It is certainly very strong, and people would talk to me during the period when I was under house arrest, both before and after my imprisonment, to show you the actual viewpoint of the people, and their dislike of communism, because there wasn't, in my experience, one person who said he liked communism. So that is the conclusion that I would come to, that I have drawn from interviewing and talking to these different people in Communist China.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does any friendship for America persist among the Chinese people?

Father TENNIEN. Yes; in prison I had these men who would whisper to you in the middle of the night. We were all crowded together in the cell and they would ask you, "Is America coming to our help? America is our greatest friend."

Coming down on the ship when I was expelled from Communist China, when the guard was away, these shipping people talked to me and they said, "Don't believe what these people are telling you. This man told me"—and he talked over the back of his hand like this, so that they would not watch and read his lips, and he said, "America is our friend and we are hoping for America to save us from what we are in now."

I think that, generally, expresses the opinion of the Chinese people, because they have been friendly, as far as I know, always, and, of course, they can be swayed and can be held under the sway of communism to voice and parrot what they are told to say and do because they train people that way under their system of indoctrination.

But when you get the unadulterated and uninfluenced opinion, there is certainly a strong influence, a strong friendship for America, and a hope that America will come to their rescue in the end.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there a resistance movement in Red China?

Father TENNIEN. There is a desire for resistance, and it is very numerous, but I think the Communists have it under such strict control that it doesn't amount to very much, effectively. It would be there to depend on and count on if they ever wanted to use that. That is certain, because human nature can be pushed only to a certain extent and certain limits, and after that it begins to rebel and hate the system that is torturing it so strongly that it will then just break out the same as it has done in Hungary and Poland and other countries.

That is there in China. It may take some time, but it certainly is going to break out and rebel against the system and, of course, that

is our hope because when any government can't get loyalty—if we did not have loyalty of our people here in America, if we were holding them under a dictatorship, under a tyranny, when the occasion arose or when the opportunity or promise of relief arose, they would immediately take it and overthrow the government.

That is the weakness, of course, of communism everywhere, because they cannot command and have any loyalty to the system.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are any of the so-called four freedoms protected in Red China, freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom from fear, and freedom of worship? Let's take them one by one. Is there any freedom of speech in Red China?

Father TENNIEN. There is no freedom of speech in Red China. There isn't, of course, in any Communist country. We used to think that Chinese communism might be a little different, but, after watching it in operation and action a couple of years, you come to the conclusion that it is just the same there as anywhere.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is there any freedom of the press in Red China?

Father TENNIEN. There is absolutely no freedom of the press. When I was under house arrest, I used to get magazines like Time, Saturday Evening Post, Life, and those magazines, but, immediately after the Communist took over, they took all those out of the mail and would not let me get any more except to show me some of the advertisements, like they had, I remember, a cover on one of Collier's magazines showing a picnic and showing the living standards of America—people dressed in sports clothes and the table piled high with fruits and sandwiches, and everything you could imagine, and the chief of police came in and said, "Is that actually true?" because they heard so much propaganda against America. "Is that actually true, that you people have all that prosperity and all that wealth and all that goodness?"

I said, "Yes; that is an ordinary picture." And so they are looking and looking to America and looking at it as an ideal, perhaps rightly or wrongly, because some of our material prosperity isn't so much to the good as some other things, as our spiritual values, that we could give them. But they are looking to us.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have the Red Chinese done anything to bring about freedom from want in Red China?

Father TENNIEN. They have made a very strong effort. Now, they have accomplished quite a bit. I always try to look at these things objectively. I have been preparing to write something on it and so I would say that they have done quite a bit, but it is through their method of tyranny and force and a dictatorship which controls all human effort and all activity and, therefore, they can accomplish a lot where we couldn't under another system of government.

But you have to always counterbalance what they gain and what they lose in a system like this.

Now, if they had gained in a material way, more business, which some people may think they have—I personally do not think they have—then they have lost by their freedom of thought, their freedom of expression, their freedom of press, and they are mere cogs in the wheel of communism to go along and do as they are told to do.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you saying, Father, that they have traded their freedoms and their natural rights for a minimum of security, or do they have even that minimum of security in Red China today?

Father TENNIEN. What kind of security?

Mr. SOURWINE. Physical security.

Father TENNIEN. With inflation and all the other things, I think they have gained a certain material prosperity, a certain advancement. But to do that they have surrendered and lost other balancing things. They have lost freedom and they have lost far more than they have gained.

Mr. SOURWINE. How about the fourth freedom, freedom from fear? Do they have that in Red China today?

Father TENNIEN. I think that is one of the most difficult things under the Communist system, this great fear under which they live, because nobody can talk to his brother or sister without distrusting him and thinking that he will report on him, and they live in constant fear because they are spied upon and watched. Even when I was under house arrest, I would see the children who were taught to spy creep up to the windows and listen to any official who would come to talk with me when I was under house arrest, and he would be very cautious. He would never come inside unless he was with another official, because he would be reported and he wanted to have a witness.

It is some kind of dog-eat-dog system and everybody is living in fear.

Senator JENNER. How does that affect the family life? In other words, the family life was always a strong unit in China.

Father TENNIEN. It is a strong unit.

Senator JENNER. How was that affected?

Father TENNIEN. There has been quite a lot of disloyalty among family members, because the Communists work these people up by a system of indoctrination to thinking that the state is so glorious that it counts more than your family relations and you should, therefore, report on your father if he is saying something against the government, or the father should report on the mother, and vice versa, because it is the glory of the state.

They are aiming at the glory of this great new paradise, which the Communists want to bring about—this utopia. But the family, of course, is the great unit in China as it is everywhere else, and I think even more so in China, because they are not dissipated and not broken apart. They are more unified in China than they are, I would say, in a country like America where we are constantly moving to the cities and working in industries.

But, in China, the family unit of these farming people is very strong, great loyalty among the family members.

Senator HRUSKA. Getting back to the freedom of the press that you talked about a little bit, are there any such things as outlawed newspapers or any such things as pamphlets which are printed which would indicate an underground or resistance movement?

Father TENNIEN. That is not very evident. I don't think there are papers like this widely circulated. The "bamboo wireless" that they talk about in China is a wonderful system of communicating. It brings true news, false news, rumors, and all sorts of things. So the news does get around. Even the news that is against Communist China and the news which is favorable to America does get around. Even the victories when the Korean war was going on—I was in prison and during the interrogation he would ask me how I knew about so many of these things.

These things pass around from one person to another and they are whispered to you in the day or in the night or even in a prison cell if the Communists failed in their objective in driving through Korea.

So, that carries on, but nothing that you could see, no open papers carried on because it can't be done.

Nationalists have dropped a great many pamphlets. They have made a great many excursions into China, and I think that is an excellent way of arousing dissatisfaction with the present government and giving hope to those people of relief at some future time.

As far as radios and other communications, they are so rare and so few in China, except in the big cities, that you can't get very much news in through radio. But where they do have them in the cities, like when the Communists first came in when I was in Canchiang, south China, they regulated that radio. They took in all the others around the town and they had one in the central part of the town that everybody could listen to, and you could listen to Nanking, Peking, or Russian stations, but no others. If you were even reported to have listened to another station, it meant interrogation and probably a jail sentence.

Senator HRUSKA. Is there any degree of religious freedom in Red China, would you say?

Father TENNION. There is a degree of religion in Red China. I think it is mostly for the window-dressing. They let religion go on to a certain extent in the big cities and they let religion operate, and the ministers and priests of religion operate as long as they are subject to them, and that is why there has been a great conflict going on in China between a state-governed religion and the Roman Catholic religion.

You see, it offers competition. They want loyalty only to them, and they want to be the idols and they want to be the people worshiped, the people obeyed, and if people are loyal to God and are really loyal to the Roman Catholic faith, it offers a very strong competitor which they are trying to ruin.

Now, they are using various means, various ways to destroy religion. First of all, they started to close the churches in the country, and after that they closed a great many of them in the city. I had evidence of over 500 Chinese priests in jail last summer when I left, out of around 2,000 Chinese priests. There were something over 2,000 Chinese priests but we had definite knowledge of over 500 of them that were in prison because we got letters from others and they used terms like, "He is in the hospital," or, "He is undergoing the Pauline Privilege," like St. Paul being jail, and things like that, the other priests would write out.

And those were free, working on the lands, and in this increased production aim of the Communists, and they are able to carry on quite a bit of underground and quite a bit they are permitted to carry on, but it is not freedom of religion, not at all.

Senator HRUSKA. Father, you have indicated that you were one of the so-called victims of indoctrination methods of the Reds and you have had many, many reports of those procedures. Could you describe some of their methods and their techniques?

Father TENNIEN. Yes. I found that a most fascinating study. In Hong Kong during the last few years I have watched these people

come out and watched their reaction and then watched them get unwound, so to speak. They came out after, perhaps, 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years of imprisonment, of intense indoctrination, having been cut off from the outside world and being fed only this Communist way of thinking.

Now, many of them came out and they were mentally disturbed. It took them 3 weeks, 4 weeks, some of them even a month before they began to lose their fear and they began to get their balance.

They would come out and want to write Mao Tse-tung thanking him for the nice treatment after keeping them in slave labor for 3 or 4 years. And they would come out—they were thinking like Communists. They had been so brainwashed and so indoctrinated that they weren't normal.

Senator HRUSKA. Is that achieved by classes or by any concentrated methods, or is it simply a way of life that they lead them through and get them to thinking in those terms?

Father TENNIEN. That is a universal system under communism. I think if you want to understand it, you have to look at it like this. I have thought about it a great deal since I have come out and thought about the Pavlov theory. You know, Pavlov, this Russian biologist, developed this theory after experimenting with rats, cats, and dogs, and saying that you could apply certain punishment, certain inducements, certain rewards, and you could get that animal to change its reaction from a normal reaction and follow out exactly as the person wanted that animal to do by certain training and punishment and discipline.

The Communists, of course, believe that men are only animals, that we are without a soul, and that a man's reflexes can be so conditioned and so changed that he will think according to party-line thought.

Now, in order to accomplish that, they have to indoctrinate the people. They have brought in indoctrinators from Russia. Many of their men studied in Russia and they follow the blueprint of what is to happen today and tomorrow and all the details of how it was done in Russia.

Now, they start in by tackling the teachers. After the schoolteachers, then they indoctrinate the village leaders and these people of influence and this goes on for almost the first year after the system has come in.

Then they take these men and they divide a whole country and with these leaders, schoolteachers, village chiefs, and county chiefs, and all, then they instruct the whole mass of people.

Now, these people have to be changed so that they will think according to the Communist way of thinking, and that means, of course, that the Politburo and the other people are going to give the orders, are going to tell you what to think and what to say and what to do and that you are to follow that without any deviation, without any contrary thought, without any contradiction, and that you will follow out and do.

So, they have got to change everybody's reflexes and they do it by discipline and they do it by indoctrination, by teaching and by enforcement, by tyranny, and if you are under that system, you will see that it works, and it does work and it changes a person. They call it brainwashing, molding the mind, and all that, and it actually does work.

Senator HRUSKA. We hear terms like persuasion and also the rule of the hickory stick. Does that fall in that same category?

Father TENNIEN. Well, nothing so gentle and mild as a hickory stick. It is something more vicious and something that you can't see. If they are working on you, they will work on you by mental torture.

Now, for instance, if you were guilty of some slight infraction, they would put you up before the interrogators and disclose all your faults and all your weaknesses and all your shortcomings, and so humiliate you and embarrass you before the crowd. That would be the first step. All right.

Then, if you went through it again you probably get a short jail sentence, a short jail sentence of 2 or 3 months, and you would go through a very serious indoctrination, and after that you either go to jail for a few years or you would be liquidated.

So, they use every psychological approach, every physiological, mental torture and physical torture and persuasion, intimidation, to create fear, the fear of reprisals and all that, to keep the people so worked up that they will follow out and think and do as they want them to do.

Senator HRUSKA. Now, Father, we are also interested in any evidence that there might be of either independence or of control, as the case may be, as to the Kremlin itself in Red China. What observations would you have to make in that regard?

Father TENNIEN. Oh, the Russian influence is very, very definite and very evident.

Senator HRUSKA. How direct is it?

Father TENNIEN. Well, that is hard for one on the outside to appraise. But judging from their statements and their praise of Russia, of course, when I was there it was all Stalin, they had it in their songs, in their cheers, in their lectures, that Stalin was the great father and the great leader of communism, and he was the one that they were imitating. They said, for instance, in their song, Si Ta Lin tsan shi shing lei—Stalin is our leader. Mao Tse-tung tsan shi shing lei—Mao Tse-tung is our No. 2 leader, and they are the ones who follow out the party line, 1 side, 1 thought, no contrary thoughts, no contradictions at all to that way of thinking.

Now, they are depending on Russia economically as well as idealistically and they are tied up and they cannot very well be torn away from them, as long as they are under the present condition of more or less being isolated.

Senator HRUSKA. Who became, in these songs, No. 1 leader when Stalin was downgraded in Russia? Was somebody put in his place, or did they leave the place void?

Father TENNIEN. Fortunately, I was in America at that time. But if you will notice, they haven't gone along. Red China was the first one to congratulate Gomulka in Poland when he declared a kind of independence. I think they are following that route of more independence from Russia than the others did. And I think they will do it because China, after all, is so much bigger than Russia, both in population and as far as tillable land goes, and her power and her influence if it comes up into its own, is what the Russians fear. Russia will become a satellite of China in the future. That is the way I see it.

Senator HRUSKA. Are they apt to continue that course of congratulating Gomulka and all that sort of thing, if that sort of conduct reflects itself adversely in their economic relations with Russia?

Father TENNIEN. Well, they are getting on their feet a little more and a little better. They are not so dependent as they were. You see, they were almost bankrupt economically and every other way, especially with the Korean war. That is why they said they had to stop their attack in Korea and make peace, because it was ruining them economically in China and their demands on the people, as I saw them go around to the villagers and tell them how much they had to give for the tanks, for the airplanes, and for the guns.

Well, that has more or less passed. They have attained a little bit more stability, I would say, but on the other hand, the only outside nation now they can get machines from, the only way they can build up and get factories going, is from Russia and the satellite countries of Russia. They can't get them from us, which is right. They shouldn't get them. And that is why they are so dependent on Russia and they will be for the next 5 years.

Mr. SOURWINE. Father, would recognition of the Chinese Red government and its admission to the United Nations be an advantage or a disadvantage to the free world?

Father TENNIEN. I think it would be a great disservice to the free world. I would think it would be a terribly fatal mistake for us to recognize Red China.

Mr. SOURWINE. Why?

Father TENNIEN. Because Red China hasn't shown any indication, hasn't given us any indication of living in the family of nations as a person of our way of thinking. Without our way of justice, without our way of trials, without our way of freedom, and if we let them in with their ideals of communism and a dictatorship, then we are letting in, well, we are letting in the bandits and robbers and everybody else to live with us and take what they want from us and they can take the most precious thing we have, and that is our freedom and democracy.

Senator HRUSKA. You were here when Mr. Anslinger testified, were you not?

Father TENNIEN. Yes.

Senator HRUSKA. Wouldn't you say that one of the evidences of their lack of moral fiber or their desire to become a respected member of the family of nations would be found, certainly, in their tolerance, to say the least, of the narcotics trade and export that they have?

Father TENNIEN. That is true, and that is only one small indication. If you run up against a people without morality, without the standards which we have, without the criterion of right and wrong, anything is right with them which is good for the advancement of communism. If you are dealing with a nation like that, you can't deal with them and you can't trust them. Never trust a Communist because they live on the policy of deceit and deception and they work by it. I always tried to look at the good side of people, but after dealing with them for 2 years and seeing the broken promises and the way they twist the truth and their deceit, we can't deal with them and we can't admit them to an equal basis of discussion with us, and we can't make any agreement with them and expect them to carry it out.

They wouldn't, they can't. If they do it, it would be against the principles of communism which they have now.

Senator JENNER. What was their reaction to the Korean truce?

Father TENNIEN. Well, they just considered that it was a victory and that, of course, they had gained a victory.

That was the way they publicized it and gave it out, and in my own way of thinking, it was more or less a victory for us not to go on and conclude a victory in our own way.

Senator JENNER. Did they brag about the fact that they have violated the terms of the truce, and the United States doesn't do anything or say anything about it?

Father TENNIEN. No, they would not approach it that way. They wouldn't say they had violated the terms of the truce at all. They can just twist it so that it appears that they are always right and they can twist and turn truths and half truths to make them look very palatable and acceptable. That is the way they twist and turn everything. They are masters at propaganda.

Senator JENNER. We have lost face as a result of it?

Father TENNIEN. Of the Korean war?

Senator JENNER. Yes.

Father TENNIEN. Yes, sir.

Senator JENNER. And face is a great thing with the Asiatics.

Father TENNIEN. It certainly is. A most important thing. People have committed suicide when they lost face, lost prestige. That is important.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you anything further?

Senator JENNER. Nothing further.

Senator HRUSKA. Thank you very much, Father, for coming before us.

(Senator Hruska at this point left the meeting and Senator Jenner assumed the chair.)

Senator JENNER (presiding). Call the next witness.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. John C. Caldwell.

Senator JENNER. Will you stand and raise your right hand, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CALDWELL. I do.

Senator JENNER. Proceed, Mr. Sourwine, with the questioning of Mr. Caldwell.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN C. CALDWELL

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, you were born in China?

Mr. CALDWELL. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. Your home is in Nashville, Tenn.?

Mr. CALDWELL. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. You are a former Director of the United States Information Service?

Mr. CALDWELL. In China.

Mr. SOURWINE. In China. You are a writer and a lecturer?

Mr. CALDWELL. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. You testified before this committee on a prior occasion, June 15, 1954.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. You make repeated trips to China?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes. Not to the mainland of China, but to the—

Mr. SOURWINE. Far East?

Mr. CALDWELL. All of the Far East.

Mr. SOURWINE. You have just returned from such a trip?

Mr. CALDWELL. The last week in November.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were at one time head of the China Branch of the United States Information Service?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. That was for a year and a half.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had charge of the whole China program for 9 months?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. And all Far East operations for 9 months.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir, approximately.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, in your prior appearance before this committee you told us about a study of Communist techniques and propaganda lines which were suppressed by USIA, because it might cause friction between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. What became of that study?

Mr. CALDWELL. I would like to know myself where it is. I have never seen it since.

Mr. SOURWINE. Is it still suppressed, as far as you know?

Mr. CALDWELL. As far as I know.

Senator JENNER. Who did you submit it to?

Mr. CALDWELL. It was submitted to the Department of State. That was in 1946.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, when you appeared before us in 1954, you told us the Communist propaganda pattern in Eastern Asia had 2 basic objectives; 1, to create in Asiatics the idea that American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines were brutal, corrupt, and immoral; and secondly, to develop among Americans the idea that our logical allies in Asia, that is, the Chiangs and the Rhees, were hopelessly corrupt and dictatorial and without ability to command the respect of their peoples.

Is that line still being followed?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, but I would say there are very important additions to the line now.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you tell us about them?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes. Particularly in Southeast Asia, which is now the main target of the Communist propaganda machine, there is an effort not only to discredit Nationalist China, but to completely keep out any information whatsoever about Nationalist China.

There is an immense campaign to penetrate schools which has been very successful, to control newspapers and book stores, and this campaign has, I think, two immediate objectives.

One, it is a rather soft campaign. It seeks to create an impression of a very peaceful China which has made tremendous material advances so that the way into the U. N. can be eased and, of course, the long-range aim is obviously control of Southeast Asia with its tremendous natural and human resources.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, you predicted in 1954, intensified Red Chinese propaganda in the Philippines. Has your prediction come true?

Mr. CALDWELL. For only a short time, fortunately, because the new President of the Philippines has gone further than any other Asiatic leader, with the exception of Diem in Vietnam, to control communism, so that the focus has now changed, particularly directed against the newly independent states that were once under French Dominion. That is, Cambodia and Laos, toward Thailand, toward all the rest of Southeast Asia with, right now, a particularly virulent campaign against North Borneo which is a weak country but a very rich British colony.

Mr. SOURWINE. You also predicted, in 1954, a campaign headed from Red China to magnify the failings of French Colonialist administration in Indochina.

Did that come about?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; there were failings which I think we must admit, but the Communists have very clearly used this legacy of colonialism in all of Southeast Asia. It is something they use constantly in their effort to create neutralism, first, and then outright interest in the Communist form.

Senator JENNER. I would be interested in your observations on Indochina at the present moment. Have you been reading about it in the last few days? Would you give us your version?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think Indonesia is one of the most critical places now, and there, as in many places throughout Southeast Asia, the main focus of attack has been the overseas Chinese community. There are about 3 million Chinese who live in Indonesia. The schools of Indonesia, among which there are nearly 400 Chinese schools, are almost completely now under Communist control.

There are literally hundreds of book stores which sell the very fancy Communist publications, some of which I have brought along.

The press of Indonesia, as far as the Chinese are concerned, is now entirely under Communist domination, and I think those factors, since the Chinese control economic life, have a particular part to play in what is happening in Indonesia now, the switch the internal troubles.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, you told us in 1954 that State Department files were, to use your words:

Stacked today with anti-Chiang, anti-Nationalist material—and that—

The same material prevails with respect to Syngman Rhee.

You added this, quoting you—

Until several years have passed, during which we have objective anti-Communist reporting, it will be difficult to expect decisions and actions favorable to our friends in Asia.

I will ask you, has that situation changed, and if so, to what degree so far as you know?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think it has improved to some extent, but very significant stories, for instance, such as Mr. Anslinger told, of the fact that the Nationalists were able to stamp out the opium business, which I know myself, having lived there during that period, and that the Chinese Communists have increased it many times; things of that type

never get to the people of Asia who should hear them. So, there is still, I am afraid, too much bias, perhaps a legacy of the past.

It is not only in the State Department, but you find it among editors throughout the country, a bitterness against the Nationalist Government and it is often not based on any facts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, in that connection, you told us in 1954 that you believed that 75 percent of the editors, newspaper and magazine, in America were so prejudiced against Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee as individuals, that honest coverage of free Asia was almost impossible.

Do you still hold to that belief?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think there has been some improvement. If I were to apply a figure to it, I would say that perhaps 50 percent are still so prejudiced that it is very difficult to get the stories, for instance, of the tremendous progress of free China. You don't see too many accounts of that in our magazines and newspapers.

Mr. SOURWINE. What can you tell us about the Communist Chinese press? To what extent is that free? To what extent is that controlled?

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, all of the newspapers in Communist China are actually party organs. There are now some 10,000 newspapers, counting those in small districts. They are all completely party organs, and publishing is operated entirely by the party.

A recent Nationalist intelligence report that I saw in Hong Kong a few months ago indicates that there are a total of 3,600,000 Communist Party workers directly in information media alone. That is, radio, publications, and newspapers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would you say that there is a profession of journalism in Red China today?

Mr. CALDWELL. No, sir, I would not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, how about journalism in the rest of Asia? To what extent is that subverted or controlled?

Mr. CALDWELL. During the past 12 to 18 months there have been three primary Red campaigns. One, to control the press of Southeast Asia. Two, to open vast numbers of book stores with as many as 200 and 300 titles on Communist China in each store. Three, to penetrate and control the one-thousand-nine-hundred-odd Chinese schools from Hong Kong southward.

Now, to show you how this campaign has succeeded, during the last possibly 12 months, but let's say 18 months, of the 35 major newspapers of Southeast Asia, 27 have become either pro-Communist completely or neutralist. That has, as I said, mostly been accomplished in 1 year and it has been accomplished with a massive bribery campaign. I have the exact figures on many newspapers, the exact amount paid to the editor as a downpayment to change his editorial line, the amount he gets each month or sometimes it may be that the newspaper is struggling and having financial difficulties and there are free gifts of newsprint.

Now, both our intelligence and Nationalist intelligence indicate that in 1956, \$3 million United States was spent on newspaper bribery alone, and it is through that, coupled with a sort of veiled threat. I have actually talked to editors who have been approached and along with the offer of money comes this little clincher. They say, and if you will play ball with us, we will take care of you when we take over here.

So, it is a promise of security plus money that has bought the press of Southeast Asia.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say \$3 million United States. Are you using United States dollars as a standard or do you actually mean that United States dollars were used in this bribery?

Mr. CALDWELL. No; I know that United States dollars are used, but I was using that mostly as a round figure of the total amount in our currency.

Mr. SOURWINE. The bribery is not, so far as you know, wholly in United States dollars.

Mr. CALDWELL. No, but in a place like Hong Kong, which is a free-money market, the United States dollar is usually quite stable. The Hong Kong dollar is slipping, particularly in the last 6 months.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where does that money come from?

Mr. CALDWELL. It is my guess that quite a bit of it comes from the opium business. The Reds have tried something else new, of late. In Thailand, with Communist money, they have developed the dirty movie capital of the world now, with some 4,000 titles produced last year alone.

Now, these are sent to Formosa, to Hong Kong, to Japan. They are sold for dollars. They have the same sort of dual purpose that opium serves, of bringing in dollars as well as corrupting morals.

One little sidelight. It may mean absolutely nothing. Through my knowledge of Chinese, I was able to get into one of these studios in Bangkok, and I noted with great interest that all of the equipment was the latest model Russian equipment, that is, projectors and cameras of varieties I had never seen before.

Mr. SOURWINE. What other information can you give us about Red China's propaganda machinery?

Mr. CALDWELL. I would like to go just a little bit, if I may, into their publications. Now, I have brought a few typical ones here today. These happened to be in English, but others are published in 13 different languages.

They start with simple cartoon books for the illiterate. Then there will be little storybooks like this, up to the very fancy, four-color jobs.

Now, the effort in these publications is, well, what I would call a soft line. It attempts to create interest in Red China, a picture of tremendous progress, a country that has no problems.

Now, their anti-American line has changed considerably. They don't ask a newspaper, for instance, any longer to actually attack America. Instead, they distribute Confidential magazine, and there is another one called Uncensored.

Now, these magazines—I assume none of you gentlemen have read them regularly; I don't, but I have looked at them and I know that they deal in divorce, sex, dope, all of the worst in America, and these stories are taken verbatim from Confidential and used as feature material in Bangkok, in Hong Kong, in Phnom Penh, which is the capital of Cambodia.

So, many people are getting their view of America today via Confidential magazine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that conclude the additional material you can give us about propaganda?

Mr. CALDWELL. No; I think the penetration of the schools is also tremendously important. The Chinese in some places are even the

majority in southeast Asia. For instance, in Singapore they make up 80 percent of the population, and, beginning many years ago, they founded their own schools.

Now, the Communists have penetrated these schools. In Singapore they are almost entirely in charge now. In Thailand perhaps one-third of the schools are under Communist discipline.

They utilize the students to raise money. For instance, in Singapore they raise money for strikes through collecting dues from the Communist students. They have been able, on several occasions, to completely tie up Singapore.

Along with this effort to penetrate and control all the schools in southeast Asia, there is a tremendous campaign to get young southeast Asians to go to Red China to study. Now, to do that they use these publications, magazines, very well-done movies. They promise free education. They promise the school of the person's choice and unlimited job opportunities after the student is finished.

Since 1950, somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 overseas students have been enticed to Red China through this campaign.

Mr. SOURWINE. Speaking of students, sir, what steps are being taken inside Red China to indoctrinate the youth of the country with communism?

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, it is an indoctrination program from the time the child is able to understand anything. During October and November I interviewed a number of student escapees from China to try to get from them a blow-by-blow account of Communist educational methods. A tremendous part of the curriculum is taken by with completely political discussions. At least once every week, and sometimes 2 or 3 times, there is held what the students in their lingo call the "big class."

Now, the big class is when an eavesdropper has been able to find some student saying something that was suspect. He is brought before the whole school body and, as Father Tennien explained, all of his faults, his background, are brought out, and sometimes the student body is just driven into a state of hysteria so that there is actually physical beating of the person who is the center of the big class.

But it is a program of indoctrination from beginning to end.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that program involve efforts to make the youths of China inform on their friends and relatives?

Mr. CALDWELL. That is a very definite part. I talked to one young man, for instance, who was talking to a friend of his one night in school and the friend admitted, or just said in conversation, that he had served once as an interpreter during the war with a United States Army unit since he spoke very good English. Another friend overheard. There was a big class called the next day and this boy simply disappeared. So, telling tales is an integral part of the system of maintaining discipline over the students.

Mr. SOURWINE. To what extent are they successful in getting children to inform on their parents in contradiction to the age-old closeness of the Chinese family?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think in the first few years of Communist rule they were very successful, but then in the last few years I have noted, in talking to escapees, what I think is a tide of revulsion setting in. I think that is indicated by recent stories that have come out of Red

China, renewed demands that everyone put the state above any family relationships.

I think there are good things that we can see in Red China today. That is one of them. In talking to the escapees, I find there is growing unrest among the young people. Just as in Hungary, it was the college students and even the high-school students who spearheaded the revolt, so, in China, the young people are fighting back to the extent that there are a great number of, literally translated, roaming hard-labor corps, entirely made up of high-school students who have been recalcitrants, have fought back a little bit.

I interviewed one boy who was in such a camp in which there were 6,000 high-school students all put at hard labor because they have not knuckled down sufficiently to the regime. That is, I think, a rather hopeful sign.

Mr. SOURWINE. Turning to another subject, what can you tell us, Mr. Caldwell, about the coexistence policy advocated by Communist China?

Mr. CALDWELL. That, of course, is a crucial part of their campaign, particularly with the new nations, Indonesia, Burma, Cambodia, and Laos. They try hard to show through their propaganda and publications that they mean no harm and that the best interests of these new nations will be served if they will maintain diplomatic relations with the Chinese Reds.

In Cambodia they have recently offered, and it has been accepted, a \$22 million economic-aid campaign to show their good will, so that they are directly competing with us in that country, offering relatively the same number of dollars that we give to that same nation.

The coexistence and neutrality, I would say, are very important themselves at the present time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does the stress on that theme of coexistence indicate an abandonment by Red China of its ambitions to rule all Asia?

Mr. CALDWELL. No; I don't think it does at all. I think that they are succeeding through subversion. They don't need, right now, to think in terms of any military action. I would doubt that there will be any military action, because they are doing extremely well through this vast campaign of subversion and propaganda.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you familiar, sir, with the pressures originating in Communist China for repatriation of Chinese students and Chinese residents in general who are now outside mainland China?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes. That ties in, of course, with the campaign to get the overseas Chinese students all through southeast Asia to come back. When a student does go to Red China, a great deal of pressure is put upon him to persuade his parents to come back, and the interesting thing is that this pressure is only given when the parents are wealthy. They are most interested in getting wealthy overseas Chinese back into China.

Mr. SOURWINE. What can you tell us, Mr. Caldwell, about Red Chinese efforts to use the 10 million Chinese now living in southeast Asia as a sort of huge fifth column?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think that is their major effort. These Chinese actually number now—the latest census, I believe, is nearly 14 million because there have been a great many escapees from China and their major campaign is directed against the Chinese newspapers, the Chinese schools, against the Chinese banks, because these Chinese control the economic life of the region.

Now, in Rangoon, Burma, for instance, they gained control of the three main Chinese banks. Then they used that as a lever to force Chinese businessmen to send their children to a Chinese school. Chinese are speculators. They borrow frequently on a short-term basis. If a businessman comes in to try to borrow money from one of these banks, he is told he can't have his money unless he is willing to transfer his children from a non-Communist to a Communist dominated school. It is rather a striking double play they use in combining banking and education.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you tell us about any other trouble spots caused by Communist agitators in southeast Asia?

Mr. CALDWELL. The most successful trouble spot has been, of course, Singapore. I think right now the main pressure is going to be against the three Buddhist nations, that is, Cambodia, Thailand and Laos. It is my own opinion that Cambodia is going to be the focus of an attack because it is small. It is new and weak. Thailand is a much stronger country, but if they can gain control of Cambodia, they will have a strong foothold to put pressure against the other two Buddhist nations.

In Cambodia they now control 4 of the 5 Chinese newspapers. They control one-half of the Chinese schools. They have this \$22 million aid program administered by a total of 120 technicians who began arriving in November and who are all there now.

Mr. SOURWINE. What information can you give us about Red Chinese activity in Malaya and Indonesia?

Mr. CALDWELL. It is the same pattern everywhere. In Malaya it has been very successful. It is hard to evaluate where there has been more success. I would say that probably Indonesia and Malaya have both been very well penetrated as far as the overseas Chinese are concerned.

One way you can judge it is by the number of students who are going to Red China from these countries. Now, the number has dropped in the last 2 years, but in 1956, 1,200 went from Indonesia, 750 from Malaya, by far the largest than from any other country in southeast Asia.

Mr. SOURWINE. The Chinese, that is, the people of Chinese origin, or the Chinese race, pretty largely control business life in Malaya and Indonesia, don't they?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, and it is true in Thailand. It is true in Cambodia. They control the banks, the newspapers, publications, movies, the rice industry. They are the middlemen also in many other businesses.

Mr. SOURWINE. The middlemen?

Mr. CALDWELL. Middlemen.

Senator JENNER. Merchants.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. To what extent are those Chinese businessmen lined up with communism, do you know?

Mr. CALDWELL. The further away you get from Communist China, the larger proportion of the Chinese are pro-Communist. That is simply because they are further away and they don't have access to information, actual facts about Red China.

Hong Kong, I would say, just using a round figure, is probably 70 percent anti-Communist. Singapore, however, is 70 percent pro-Communist.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is among the Chinese colony.

Mr. CALDWELL. Among the Chinese colony. And again that in part depends on how thoroughly they have controlled the press.

Now, in Singapore, they have been in control of press and education for several years. But in Hong Kong not only do they get news of Red China right across the border, also they have had a somewhat more difficult time buying off the press.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, is sheer fear of Communist China a major factor in the neutrality of India and Burma and Indonesia?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think that is a very correct statement. As Father Tennien pointed out, Korea was not a victory for the West. There has been to the average person of southeast Asia a succession of retreats and there is fear that the Communists are going to win.

I, myself, do not believe in my heart most of these people are pro-Communist, but they are trying to make a move which will keep them safe, their families safe, and they hope their businesses intact.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, you said earlier in response to a question that you did not feel that Communist China's ambition to control all Asia had been abandoned. What evidence is there of that ambition?

Mr. CALDWELL. For economic reasons it is tremendously important. We know that. For instance, Thailand has a surplus of 300,000 tons of rice which they will not sell to Red China, but which they desperately need. And also, throughout their internal propaganda you hear phrases that sound strikingly like Japan's old "coprosperity sphere."

They are offering to become the big brothers of all these struggling nations. They offer it particularly, I think, now, in the campaign against the three little Buddhist nations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, do you know anything about the activities of Red Chinese agents outside China?

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, of course, what I have been telling you deals with activities all through southeast Asia. Hong Kong has become pretty much their center. It is the center from which these publications are shipped out, incidentally, to American schools, in large numbers. It is the center into which the bribery money goes and is disbursed.

From Hong Kong, which has direct shipping connections with Japan and Korea, as well as southeast Asia, the agents go to the rest of the area. It is the focal point, I think, of their attack, or the campaign headquarters today.

Mr. SOURWINE. What can you tell us about the activities of Red Chinese agents in South Korea?

Mr. CALDWELL. I haven't been in South Korea for a year and the biggest activity that I heard about at that time was one mentioned by Mr. Anslinger and that is the penetration of dope peddlers, large numbers of them. Many of them are caught, but obviously, many are not caught.

Mr. SOURWINE. Are you telling us that the dope peddlers in South Korea are Communists, that it is a Communist activity?

Mr. CALDWELL. Oh, yes, sir; I am certain of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. How about activities of Red Chinese agents in Formosa, is there any?

Mr. CALDWELL. Practically none. Formosa is probably as free of Communist activity as any nation in the world and it is kept under

control. The people are sold enough on their Government so that a rather unusual thing happened in October when pro-Communist Chinese from southeast Asia, for the first time, were openly invited to come there as a propaganda move to let them see for themselves the advancement that had been made in free China.

Mr. SOURWINE. To what extent is that invitation being accepted, do you know?

Mr. CALDWELL. I know of several. I know of one Singapore editor that came and, I believe, there were several from Hong Kong and Cambodia that accepted the invitation, and free China has relaxed very greatly its visa requirements during the last few months because they feel considerable strength. They have no fear that these people can cause trouble. In fact, they think that they can very easily be convinced of the error of their ways.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, do Red Chinese imperialistic aims extend outside Asia?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think Asia is their assigned sphere of influence, but because the Chinese are not white, I think they are being used more and more among other nonwhite peoples. They made, as you know, an offer of volunteers to Egypt. They have been sending trade missions all through the Middle East in countries that do not recognize Nationalist China, and this is an opinion only, but I believe the Chinese will more and more be used as agents in nonwhite parts of the world.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you include Africa?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; I certainly do. North Africa, particularly.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have any specific knowledge of their reasons?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have knowledge of activities in Egypt, which has recognized Red China, which has received cultural delegations and trade delegations.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you have knowledge of any Red Chinese activity in Africa?

Mr. CALDWELL. Nothing beyond Egypt.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, we had one witness this morning who testified concerning the effect of admitting Communist China to the United Nations. We would like to have your opinion on it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I would like to confine my answer to the effect on southeast Asia where there is this tremendous struggle now to keep the nations free. There must be a China for the overseas Chinese to look to. If Red China is admitted, we will have, in fact, this two-China idea, and I am afraid there would be no chance whatsoever then to keep the nations of southeast Asia free. It could be a tragedy that could lose us an area that has something like 180 million population.

Mr. SOURWINE. How would there be two Chinas? If Red China is admitted to the United Nations, doesn't that necessarily mean that the Nationalist Government will go out?

Mr. CALDWELL. The Nationalist Government would go out, so I have been told by President Chiang, himself, but it is an idea that has been expressed by several public leaders in America of admitting Red China and, at the same time, maintaining some relations with free China to establish, as far as we are concerned, two Chinas.

Now, although we might not recognize Red China, if she is in the U. N., with her representatives here in America, to many people throughout Asia it would be tantamount to recognition on our part.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, people talk about the two-China policy, but isn't that in itself propaganda? I mean this. Instead of simply bringing Red China into the U. N., and leaving Nationalist China there, which would be a true two-China policy—

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Isn't all of the drive based on the representation, the admission angle, the question of who is China?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that if Mao Tse-tung's government is allowed in, Chiang's government is forced out at one and the same time.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is correct.

Mr. SOURWINE. So it is not really a two-China policy. It is a one-China policy at the expense of Nationalist China.

Mr. CALDWELL. It is actually eliminating free China. Thailand, for instance, at the present time maintains diplomatic relations with free China, not Red. I am sure if Red China was admitted to the United Nations that would be reversed. Thailand would be forced to recognize Red China.

Mr. SOURWINE. Would that be true of other countries of southeast Asia?

Mr. CALDWELL. Most of them—Cambodia is sitting on the fence. They are recognizing both, and the British territories, of course, have no Chinese representation at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, I have no more questions along that line. I do want to ask you questions about one individual that the committee is interested in. Before I do that, I would like to give you an opportunity of adding anything you think should be covered in your testimony that we haven't asked you. We would be glad to have you tell us that.

Mr. CALDWELL. No, sir; I think we have covered particularly the propaganda campaign very clearly.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Caldwell, when you were attached to USIA, did you have in your department a woman named Mary Barrett?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. To your knowledge, was Miss Barrett ever reprimanded for slanting OWI or State Department printed material or broadcasts in a pro-Communist way?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have a memory of a reprimand which did not specifically deal with that, but with her effort to distribute certain of our publications in Communist areas of China which at that time was strictly against my policy and that of USIS in China.

Mr. SOURWINE. To your knowledge, did Miss Barrett live in Shanghai with a woman named Sylvia Campbell before the latter married John W. Powell?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir; she did.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know how long that relationship existed?

Mr. CALDWELL. I would say approximately a year. In 1945 and 1946, possibly into 1947, but that I could not be certain of.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did Mary Barrett join the staff of China Review?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes. I believe she stayed in Shanghai for about a year, perhaps more, after the Communists took over, working on the China Review.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know anything, of your own knowledge, that would indicate the China Review was an official or semiofficial organ of the Chinese Communist government?

Mr. CALDWELL. I only know from American soldiers I have talked to, myself, and from testimony given before congressional committees, that that magazine was widely used in the indoctrination courses given to captured American soldiers.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, I have no more questions of this witness.

Senator JENNER. I have no further questions.

The committee will stand recessed. We want to thank you for appearing before us and giving us this information.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., the committee stood in recess.)

INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the names of an individual or an organization in this index.

A

	Page
Africa	3642
Africa, North	3642
America	3626–3628, 3631, 3637, 3641–3644
American soldiers	3644
American troops	3619
Anslinger, Harry J.	3611–3624, 3635, 3641 Testimony of
	3611–3624
	Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department
	3611
	Vice Chairman, United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs
	3611
Anti-Chiang material	3635
Anti-Nationalist material	3635
Army, United States	3619, 3638
Asia	3612, 3614, 3618, 3619, 3634, 3636, 3639, 3642
Asia, Eastern	3634
Asia, Southeast	3620, 3624, 3634–3638, 3640–3643
Asiatics	3633

B

Bangkok	3615, 3618, 3621, 3637
Barrett, Mary	3643
Bharmo district	3618, 3620
Burma	3618, 3620, 3624, 3639–3641
Burmese Government	3618

C

Caldwell, John C.	3633–3644
Testimony of	3633–3644
Born in China	3633
Home, Nashville, Tenn.	3633
Former Director of the United States Information Service	3633
Writer and lecturer	3633
Testified before subcommittee, June 15, 1954	3633
Cambodia	3635, 3637, 3639, 3640, 3642
Campbell, Sylvia	3643
(Wife of John W. Powell)	3643
Ceylon	3618, 3621
Chanchiang (South China)	3629
Chiang Kai-shek	3634, 3636
Chiang, President	3642
Chiengrai	3615
China	3618, 3624, 3625, 3628, 3629–3634, 3638, 3639, 3642, 3643
China mainland	3611, 3615, 3616
China Mission News Service	3625
China Review	3643, 3644
Chinese	3637
Chinese banks	3639, 3640
Chinese colony	3641
Chinese newspapers	3639, 3640
Chinese priests	3629
Chinese schools	3639, 3640
Chinese Reds	3639
Chungking Listening Post (publication)	3625

	Page
Collier's (magazine)	3627
Committee on Illicit Traffic of the United Nations, report of	3611
Communism	3626, 3627, 3630, 3633, 3635
Communist/s	3618, 3626, 3628, 3629, 3630, 3632, 3634, 3635, 3638, 3641, 3644
Communist agents	3619, 3624, 3641
Communist China	3611-3613, 3616-3623, 3626-3629, 3631, 3632, 3635-3644
Communist China and Illicit Narcotic Traffic	3612
Communist, Chinese	3621, 3622
Communist Chinese press	3636
Communist educational methods	3638
Communist money	3637
Communist Party	3618, 3636
Communist school, Rashin	3619
Communist system	3628
Confidential (magazine)	3637
Crown trademark	3616, 3620
D	
Diem	3635
E	
Economic and Social Council	3612
Egypt	3642
English	3637
Europe	3613
Exhibit No. 439—United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs—Eighth Session	3614
Exhibit No. 440—Red China and the Narcotic Traffic, 1956	3620
Exhibit No. 441—Memorandum on George Douglas Poole et al.	3623
Ezrin, Juda	3622
F	
Far East	3612-3614, 3619, 3621, 3623, 3634
Formosa	3613, 3637, 3641
Four freedoms	3627
French Colonialist administration	3635
French Dominion	3635
G	
Gomulka	3631, 3632
H	
Holy Cross, Baltimore	3624
Hong Kong	3612-3615, 3618, 3620-3623, 3625, 3629, 3636, 3637, 3641, 3642
Honolulu	3623
Hruska, Senator	3611
Hungary	3626, 3639
I	
India	3641
Indonesia	3635, 3639-3641
Indochina	3635
Iron Curtain	3613
J	
Japan	3613, 3615, 3618, 3621, 3624, 3637, 3641
Jenner, Senator	3611
K	
Kengtung	3618, 3620
King, Leon	3618, 3621
Korea	3629, 3632, 3641
Korea, South	3619, 3641
Korean truce	3633
Korean war	3628
Kremlin	3631

L

	Page
Laos	3635, 3640
Life (magazine)	3627
London	3618
Longobardi, Anthony J.	3621, 3623
Los Angeles	3621

M

Macao	3613, 3615
Malaya	3614, 3616, 3640
Malaya, Federation of	3612, 3615, 3620
Chief Minister	3612, 3614
Mandalay	3618, 3620
Mao Tse-tung	3630, 3631, 3643
Mao Tse-tung tsan shi shing lei (Mao Tse-tung is our No. 2 leader)	3631
Maryknoll	3624
Maryknoll Mission Society	3624
Maryknoll Office, 121 East 29th Street, New York City	3624
Maryknoll Prep.	3625
Mexico	3617
Middle East	3614, 3617, 3642
Moeller, Thomas	3621, 3623
Moeller, William	3621, 3623
Montreal	3624
Movie capital	3637

N

Nanking	3629
Narcotic Control Act of 1956	3621, 3623
Narcotics, Bureau of	3611, 3623
San Francisco office	3623
Nashville, Tenn.	3633
Nationalists	3629, 3635
Nationalist China	3634, 3642, 3643
Nationalist Government	3617, 3624, 3636, 3642
Nationalist intelligence report	3636
Near East	3613, 3614
North America	3615
North Borneo	3635

O

Orient	3621, 3623
OWI	3643

P

Pauline Privilege	3629
Pavlov	3630
Pavlov theory	3630
Peiping Government	3617
Peking	3629
Philippines	3635
Philippines, President of	3635
Pnom Penh (capital of Cambodia)	3637
Pittsford, Vt.	3624
Poland	3626, 3631
Polish delegates	3617
Politburo	3630
Poole, George Douglas	3621, 3623
Powell, John W.	3643
Propaganda machinery, Red China's	3637
Propaganda, Red Chinese	3635

R

Rangoon	3640
Rashin	3619
Red China. (<i>See Communist China.</i>)	
"Red China and the Narcotic Traffic, 1946"	3620

	Page
Rhees -----	3634
Rhee, Syngman -----	3635, 3636
Richardson, King S -----	3622, 3623
Roman Catholic religion -----	3629
Russia -----	3630, 3632
Russian delegates -----	3617
Russian equipment -----	3637
Russian stations -----	3629
S	
Saigon -----	3618, 3621
St. Paul -----	3629
San Francisco -----	3618, 3621, 3624
San Francisco Harbor -----	3622, 3623
Saturday Evening Post (magazine) -----	3627
Schroeder, F. W -----	3611
Seattle -----	3621
Second World War -----	3625
Shanghai -----	3643, 3644
Singapore -----	3612, 3614-3616, 3638, 3640, 3642
Sourwine, J. G -----	3611
South Korea. (<i>See</i> Korea, South.) -----	3631
Stalin -----	3631
<i>Si Ta Lin tsan shi shing lei</i> (Stalin is our leader) -----	3631
State, Department of -----	3634-3636, 3643
T	
Taiwan -----	3615
Tennien, Father Mark -----	3624-3633, 3638, 3641
Testimony of -----	3624-3633
Maryknoll Mission Society -----	3624
Native, Pittsford, Vt -----	3624
School—Montreal, Holy Cross in Baltimore, Maryknoll -----	3624
Ordained in 1927—Went to China in 1928 -----	3625
Taught at Maryknoll Prep -----	3625
Wrote Chungking Listening Post -----	3625
1952 expelled from China -----	3625
Returned as director of China Mission News Service, stationed in Hong Kong -----	3625
Editor of mission bulletin 1953-56 -----	3625
Thailand -----	3612-3615, 3620, 3624, 3635, 3637, 3640, 3641, 3643
Time (magazine) -----	3627
Tokyo -----	3621
Treasury Department -----	3611
Two-China policy -----	3643
U	
Uncensored (magazine) -----	3637
United Kingdom -----	3612, 3614, 3616
United Nations -----	3615, 3617, 3619, 3620, 3621, 3623, 3632, 3642, 3643
United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs -----	3611-3615, 3620
Eleventh session -----	3614
United States -----	3616, 3618, 3621-3623, 3633, 3634, 3636, 3637
USIA -----	3634, 3643
USIS (United States Information Service) -----	3633, 3634, 3643
V	
Vietnam -----	3618, 3621, 3635
W	
Watson, John M -----	3618, 3621
Williams, Gerald F -----	3621, 3623
Wood, James C -----	3621, 3623
X	
Yunnan -----	3616, 3620



DEPOSITORY

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS**

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

**SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE
UNITED STATES**

MARCH 12 AND 21, 1957

PART 56

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



**UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1957**

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

OCT 9 - 1957

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Missouri
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
MATTHEW A. NEELY, West Virginia
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina
MATTHEW A. NEELY, West Virginia

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska

ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*
J. G. SOURWINE, *Associate Counsel*
WILLIAM A. RUSHER, *Associate Counsel*
BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

C O N T E N T S

Testimony of—		Page
Emmerson, John K.	-----	3645
		III

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

The following testimony was made public on March 14, 1957, by resolution of the subcommittee.

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1957

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER
INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:15 p. m. in room 135, Senate Office Building, Senator William E. Jenner, presiding.

Present: Senators Jenner and Watkins.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; William A. Rusher, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director, and Robert Manus, investigations analyst.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Emmerson, will you stand to be sworn, please?

Senator JENNER. Do you swear the testimony you give in this hearing will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Emmerson, would you give your name and address to the reporter?

TESTIMONY OF JOHN K. EMMERSON, DEPUTY CHIEF OF MISSION, COUNSELOR OF EMBASSY, BEIRUT, LEBANON

Mr. EMMERSON. John K. Emmerson, my present post is the American Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon.

Mr. MORRIS. And what is your actual assignment at this time?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am deputy chief of mission, and counselor of embassy, at Beirut.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you on a special assignment here in the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been on a special assignment to the General Assembly in the United Nations with the United States delegation since the 1st of November.

Senator JENNER. Let the record show Senator Watkins is now here.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator Watkins, this is Mr. John K. Emmerson, our witness today, and these gentlemen are Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Hipsley of the State Department.

The witness has just now been sworn, Senator. We are asking his present special assignment here in the United States.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been assigned as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations and I am now proceeding back to my post in Beirut. In the meantime, I have been transferred to the Embassy in Paris where I expect to assume my duties toward the end of this month.

Mr. MORRIS. You will be in Paris the next assignment?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Emmerson, what has been the nature of your assignment at the United Nations?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been one of the liaison officers for the NEA area. That is the Middle East area, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs in the State Department.

Mr. MORRIS. As such, what do you do?

Mr. EMMERSON. My duties were largely liaison with the delegations from the Middle Eastern countries. We have representatives in each of the four geographic bureaus of the departments who serve in that capacity during the session of the General Assembly.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Emmerson, the reason the subcommittee has asked you to be here today is that there has accumulated in the public record of the Internal Security Subcommittee since 1951 statements, testimony about you and certain documents of yours, so we felt in order to have a full story, that it would be well if you would appear and give testimony on these various items.

This testimony and these items relate to a period of time when you were—and shortly thereafter—in Yenan, which was the Chinese Communist headquarters in China during the recent war. I wonder if you could begin your testimony today by telling us about your general assignment to Yenan and the nature of your duties there.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was assigned toward the end of 1943 as a political adviser to General Stilwell. I was concurrently second secretary of Embassy in Chungking and political adviser to General Stilwell.

As a Japanese language officer and Foreign Service officer who had had experience in Japan, my duties in the theater were concerned entirely with Japanese matters, interrogation of prisoners of war, psychological warfare particularly.

In the fall of 1944 our Government, or the Army, the United States Army, established in Yenan, the Communist headquarters, a United States Observers' Mission. This was done with the consent of General Chiang Kai-shek, and consisted of an Army unit in Yenan.

My assignment to the observers' section was concerned exclusively with psychological warfare matters. It was known that there was a group of Japanese prisoners of war who had been taken by the Chinese Communists and who were operating in Yenan. The head of this group was a well-known Japanese Communist by the name of Okano. That was the name he used at this period. He later used the name of Nozaka. It is one and the same person. So that, when I arrived in Yenan, the purpose of my assignment was to find out the kind of activities which were being conducted by this group of Japanese prisoners of war. At that time in 1944 we were, of course, concerned with the prosecution of the war against Japan.

The presence, I think, of an American observers' mission in Yenan indicated that there was cooperation between the Chinese Communists and ourselves as far as the war against Japan was concerned, so that

we were eager to find out the kinds of activities which the Japanese prisoners of war there were conducting, the psychological warfare that they were engaged in, and whatever information or intelligence they might have with respect to Japan.

I think, Judge Morris, that is the background of my assignment to Yenan.

Mr. MORRIS. You would report, would you not, back to your superiors on the activities of this Japanese Peoples' Emancipation League, isn't that what it was called?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. That was a Communist organization was it not?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; that was the propaganda organization of the Japanese Communist prisoners of war. They called themselves the Japanese Peoples' Emancipation League, and they put out leaflets and pamphlets of various sorts which were distributed behind the Japanese lines or in the areas which were under Japanese control, purely a propaganda operation, but of course completely under the direction of the Japanese Communist leader, Okano, who in turn was under the direction of the Chinese Communists.

Mr. MORRIS. When you wrote back to your superiors, you wrote generally sympathetically with the work that these people were doing, did you not?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was reporting on the kind of work they were doing, and it seemed to me that this was interesting to us in showing that it was possible to carry on psychological warfare against the Japanese, so if you use the word "sympathetically" to indicate that I felt that they were achieving some success in these lines, then that is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. In that connection—

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask a question there.

I am a little at a loss to know what Japanese prisoners of war could do. Were they finally discharged as prisoners or were they under somebody's custody?

How did they get the appellation of being "prisoners of war"?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were prisoners of war and they were in the custody of the Chinese Communists. They had been captured on the front lines in China by the Chinese Communists and they were kept in an area, an enclosed area.

Senator WATKINS. A compound, a prison?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was a sort of a very informal prison.

They did not have actual barriers. They trusted most of these people, and Yenan was geographically situated so that they could capture them if they tried to run away.

Senator WATKINS. Did they have arms?

Mr. EMMERSON. They had no arms. They lived in caves as most of the people in Yenan did, in the side of the mountain, but they were in a particular area of the town, and they also had what they called the Peoples Peasants and Workers School in which they conducted courses and carried on indoctrination programs of these prisoners of war.

Senator WATKINS. Were the Chinese Communists working with them at the time?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; they were under complete control of the Chinese Communists, but the Chinese entrusted the actual operation to the direction of this Japanese Communist, Okano, who was then present in Yenan and who directed the whole operation. He was a Japanese himself, but again he was subject to the orders.

Senator WATKINS. What was the operation they were doing?

Mr. EMMERSON. It consisted largely of two things. One was the psychological warfare.

Senator WATKINS. Against whom?

Mr. EMMERSON. Against the Japanese.

Senator WATKINS. In the homeland?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the homeland and in China; that is, the Japanese Army operating in China and the Japanese homeland.

Senator WATKINS. These Japanese prisoners of war were conducting a psychological campaign, according to what you have just said, against the Japanese at home?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. And those on the mainland?

Mr. EMMERSON. They had been indoctrinated to the extent that they accepted the idea of the end of the war, opposition to militarism, and readiness to work for what they called a democratic future in Japan.

Senator WATKINS. In other words, they were seeking to undermine the armed might of Japan at that time.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. And stop the war?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; exactly.

Senator WATKINS. I did not understand what you were talking about.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Emmerson, one document is in our record and I would like to ask you if it was prepared by you. It is only a page and a half, and, if you would read it for us, I would appreciate it. Read it and identify it.

Mr. EMMERSON. You mean read it aloud?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I think so.

Mr. EMMERSON. And may I discuss it as I go along?

Mr. MORRIS. I wish you would.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. This is a report written in Yenan on November 7, 1944, a very short time after I had arrived in Yenan, and the title is "Proposed Projects Against Japan."

Copies of all our reports went to the commanding general of the theater and to the Embassy in Chungking. [Reading:]

My short study of the activities of Susumu Okano and the Japanese Peoples Emancipation League in Communist China convinces me that we can utilize the experience and achievements of this group to advantage in the prosecution of the war against Japan.

Mr. MORRIS. May I break in? You knew it was a Communist organization?

Mr. EMMERSON. I knew it was a Communist organization. I felt that the fact that they had been successful in indoctrinating prisoners of war to the point where they were willing to participate in activities directed against the Japanese military and against the Japanese regime

meant that the use of such people was a possibility, and, therefore, might contribute to our effort against Japan. [Reading:]

Without going into the details of methods and materials, all of which are being carefully investigated here, we can suggest the following proposals:

"(1) Effect the organization of an international 'Free Japan' movement. The Japanese Peoples Emancipation League (Nihon Jinmin Kaiho Renmei) has an estimated membership of 450 Japanese prisoners in north and central China. Its declared principles are democratic. It is not identified with the Communist Party."

I would like to point out here I wrote a number of other reports which gave in detail the program and the principles of this propaganda organization. They were, to a large extent—if I can recall them after this period of time—antagonism toward the militarists, the ending of the war, peace, freedom, democracy, that kind of thing.

Now, I say these were the declared principles of this organization. It was obviously a Communist organization, and that was completely known to me at the time.

Mr. MORRIS. But there is nowhere that you say that in that document?

Mr. EMMERSON. I say, "Its declared principles are democratic." The next sentence I say, "It is not identified with the Communist Party."

I might say here that the Communists deliberately did not identify it as being a Communist organization, because they expected that, by so doing, the effect would be greater among the Japanese, because, as I say, the leaflets, the material which they scattered and used in China contained the kind of platitudes which I have mentioned, "down with the militarists, surrender of Japan, democratic principles, peace," that sort of thing which, after all, in a general sense, were the same kind of things that we were talking about with respect to Japan.

Upon completion of a course of indoctrination, the more able members voluntarily prepare propaganda leaflets and engage in propaganda activities on the frontlines. There is no doubt that most of them are sincere converts to the anti-war principles of the league.

In other words, that the war was a mistake and that they were willing to work to oppose war.

Intelligence shows that the league is well known to the Japanese Army and its influence is respected and feared—

because of the propaganda work they had already been doing with the Japanese Army.

Then I say:

Organization of chapters of this association, or a similar one, among Japanese prisoners, internees, and others, in the United States, India, Australia, and other countries, should be carried out.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, send some of these back to the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. I say: "The organization of chapters of this association, or a similar one," among the Japanese prisoners and internees which were located in the United States and other areas.

Mr. MORRIS. In other words, you would send some of the Japanese Communists back to the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not believe I say that here. I say one might organize similar associations; that is, organize similar propaganda associations in the Japanese prison camps which then existed in these other countries.

Mr. MORRIS. I don't mean to labor it, Mr. Emmerson, but you say there, do you not, either this organization or a similar organization be sent back to the United States?

Just read it again.

Mr. EMMERSON (reading) :

Organization of chapters of this association—

Mr. MORRIS. That is the Japanese Peoples Emancipation League?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right—

or a similar one among Japanese prisoners, internees, and others in the United States, India, Australia, and other countries, should be carried out.

I am talking about an organization for psychological-warfare purposes which would produce leaflets and other material.

The result would be widespread dissemination of democratic ideas, the creation of a powerful Japanese propaganda organ. (It is indisputable that propaganda from a Japanese source and written by Japanese is more effective than that from enemy sources.)

Mr. MORRIS. May I break in there? Do you think that the Japanese Communists would dispense and propagate democratic ideas?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly, not basically. As I said, the leaflets which they were disseminating, if you read the text, it is simply a matter of "down with the militarists" and "end the war" and so on.

But, of course, knowing Communists, their objective would be quite different. So I would like to say right here that this suggestion was made when I was only in Yenan a short time, and was made on the experience of what they were doing, was made in the atmosphere of our great concentration upon the war effort against Japan, and our general desire to get collaboration and cooperation wherever it might be found, and I am quite aware that this does not indicate the ultimate objectives of the Communist move or of Communists anywhere.

And I may say that, when I worked on this project a little later, and a few months afterward came to Washington and presented the project to the War Department and to the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, there was no suggestion of any participation by Communists or any use of Communists or Communist material whatsoever; so I am quite aware the ultimate objectives of the Communists are far from democratic.

I was not aware and did not express here the risks which would be involved in collaboration, close collaboration, with the Communists either in the war period or afterward.

There were many people at that time who spoke in favor of the coalition governments in which Communists might participate. I think that there was a general feeling among many quarters, and some perhaps high statesmen, that collaboration with the Communists was possible. We later found out, certainly, that that was not possible, and that any collaboration with a coalition government in which Communists had a part was a danger and meant the eventual efforts of the Communists to dominate.

Senator WATKINS. Let me ask you a question. This must have been prior to Russia's entry into the war against Japan?

Mr. EMMERSON. This was prior to Russia's entry in the war against Japan.

Senator WATKINS. How long had you been in China prior to your being assigned to this particular assignment?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had been in India and Burma until about October of 1944; and I went to Chungking; was there just a brief time and then to Yenan, so I had only been in China a matter of a few weeks.

Senator WATKINS. Weeks?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. And you were sent immediately from our own headquarters in China?

Mr. EMMERSON. From Chungking, yes, to Yenan.

Senator WATKINS. We had an ambassador there at that time?

Mr. EMMERSON. We had an ambassador and General Stilwell—I have forgotten the dates, but it was just about the time when General Stilwell relinquished his command to General Wedemeyer.

Senator WATKINS. Of course, at this time, the Russians entered into the war—I mean joined with us in operations against Germany and Italy. We, of course, came into the war sometime before you were there, but what I am trying to get is the background as to what was actually happening in the general conduct of the war, irrespective of Japan.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. Of course, the Soviet Union was our ally as far as the European war was concerned, and I think already by this time it was understood or believed that the Soviet Union would go to war against Japan. I believe that Stalin had already made that promise, if I am not mistaken.

Senator WATKINS. Had you been so advised by the State Department?

Mr. EMMERSON. I don't believe so at this time; no. I don't believe so.

Mr. MORRIS. Proceed.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is No. 2. [Reading:]

(2) Encourage the organization of cells within Japan to spread defeatism and thereby reduce resistance at the time of the invasion.

Preparations are now being made to send agents directly to Japan from this (Yenan) area.

The OSS had an operation in Yenan and they were engaged in activities of this kind. I, of course, had no responsibility for OSS and no relation to their activities.

Simultaneous organization needs to be undertaken of underground cells within Japan on the same principles as the free-Japan group on the outside. Such activities would necessarily be on a small scale, but ample evidence exists that there are such elements which can be useful to us. Careful preparation is obviously essential.

(3) Set up a radio transmitter in a Communist base area such as Shantung Province for broadcasts to Japan, Korea, and Manchuria.

A transmitter on the Shantung promontory would be 400 miles nearer Japan proper than Saipan and 600 miles nearer than the northern tip of Luzon.

The Japanese Peoples Emancipation League has a strong unit in Shantung Province and is now establishing a school there. Consequently trustworthy Japanese personnel is already on the spot to operate such a station. Additional trained personnel could be recruited from the school in Yenan and sent to any designated spot.

Identification of the station with a free-Japan group would insure broadcasts of immeasurably greater effect than those of stated American (enemy) origin.

Again it is obvious that I was thinking only of the short-term activities in which propaganda in its content of a general nature calling for surrender, calling for the end of the war and abolishing of the military control, and I did not go into the risks or the long-range consequences of such an effort.

(4) Train units of Japanese for activity with American pacification operations and with military government officials during occupation.

Eighth Route Army experience has clearly proved not only that Japanese prisoners can be converted but that they can be satisfactorily and extremely effectively used in propaganda operations on the frontlines. Approximately 350 are now training and engaging in such activities on the north and central China fronts.

Such Japanese personnel, with invaluable knowledge of particular areas and of the language, could be extremely useful in assisting American Army officers in reestablishing order among the Japanese population.

Recruitment of these persons can be made from the personnel of Japanese Emancipation League chapters in China, already trained, and from prison camps under American, Australian, or British jurisdiction.

A course of training would be necessary. Issei—

that is first-generation Japanese—

and nisei in the United States could serve as instructors. Materials and the experience of the 8th Route Army would be of inestimable assistance in setting up such a project.

Mr. MORRIS. Don't you think, in retrospect at least, to have Japanese Communists work in American occupation with military government during the occupation would be a hazardous thing?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do indeed. I again was thinking—the emphasis here was on the fact that they would be Japanese, that if you were utilizing Japanese in these activities, they would be more effective than Americans or other foreigners, and I do say that issei, which means first-generation nisei-American citizens in the United States, should serve as instructors, the idea being that any of these people who were utilized would be instructed by Japanese of American citizenship or Japanese in the United States.

But I should like to add that, in February of 1945, I returned to Washington on orders of the theater commander, and at that time presented to the Provost Marshal General, who was in charge of Japanese prisoners of war, a proposal that Japanese prisoners in the hands of the United States be given a program of reeducation or indoctrination for their possible use in our effort against Japan.

That was accepted by the Provost Marshal General, and a camp was set up in Texas which was operating at the time of the surrender.

Senator WATKINS. What kind of an indoctrination?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was indoctrination in American principles, in principles of democracy, in order to combat the ideas of militarism and totalitarianism which had been instilled into the Japanese Army.

There was no suggestion of Communist indoctrination or training. And I may say that when we went into this whole matter in 1952 in the State Department, we presented a complete documentation of this particular project, and there is a history in the War Department which describes exactly what happened, including my own participation.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you bring any messages back from Okano with you?

Mr. EMMERSON. In February of 1945 when I came back to the Department, I came back on orders of General Wedemeyer for the spe-

cific purpose of discussing these projects, the one for the education of Japanese prisoners of war, the other for an organization of Japanese for purposes of psychological warfare purposes, for purposes of psychological warfare.

May I just inject parenthetically that this project, the second project, was taken up first in the Far East Subcommittee of the State Department which discussed it and it went through a number of revisions. Then it went to what was then called SWING—State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee, consisting of Secretaries of State, War, and Navy.

The proposal was discussed and approved by that body, but the date by that time was, I think, August of 1945. The surrender came about and the project was never implemented, but, needless to say, there was no suggestion of any Communist participation in that.

The only connection was that I had concluded from my experience in China that these things, that psychological warfare by Japanese against Japanese was possible, and that it was something that would be useful for us to undertake.

As a matter of fact, we already had an indoctrination camp for German prisoners of war which had been going for some time. So that was the conclusion of these two proposals.

Senator WATKINS. Did you have any instructions when you went into that area from the State Department or from General Stilwell?

Mr. EMMERSON. We had no specific instructions from the State Department. From time to time we would receive memorandums giving in very general terms the elements of the United States policy in the Far East, but there were no regular or systematic instructions.

When I went to Yenan from Chungking headquarters, my travel orders were issued by the commanding general, and—

Senator WATKINS. That was General Stilwell?

Mr. EMMERSON. General Stilwell. I have forgotten the statement or the wording, but the idea was, the purpose of my trip up there, was to engage in these activities, study the psychological warfare activities of the Japanese in Communist China.

Senator WATKINS. Were you asked to make recommendations?

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg your pardon?

Senator WATKINS. Were you asked to make recommendations?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was implicit, I think, in the assignment. I don't remember whether I was specifically asked to make any recommendations.

Senator WATKINS. What I was trying to find out is the scope of your official mission, and what did they want you to do, what were your orders, what was the whole purpose of being there?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the purpose of the mission was, since I was the only Japanese language officer civilian attached to this group, that we would try to discover what intelligence of value was coming out of Japan, particularly for psychological warfare purposes, because I had had special duties with respect to psychological warfare in the theater, and my interrogations of prisoners of war, for example, were of course not directed to obtain military information but to obtain information on the attitudes in Japan of the Japanese, of their morale, of the status of their thoughts and the whole psychological climate, which of course would be useful to us in devising the methods of psychological warfare which we wished to use.

Senator WATKINS. Did you speak the Japanese language?

Mr. EMMERSON. I speak Japanese, yes, sir, and in February 1945 I presented a memorandum to General Wedemeyer and to General Hurley, who was then the Ambassador, suggesting that I return to Washington in order to discuss these specific ideas, the indoctrination program and the psychological warfare organization.

This proposal was approved by both General Wedemeyer and Ambassador Hurley, and I returned to the State Department in February of 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. At that time, I think I asked you a while ago, did you bring any letter from Okano back?

Mr. EMMERSON. I brought, as examples of activities of this organization, I brought back a number of materials including charts, pamphlets, leaflets, as objects of the work they were doing. I also brought back 2 or 3 letters, as I recall, which were simply statements of the principles and ideas of these psychological warfare organizations.

Mr. MORRIS. Okano gave you this before you left?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Did he tell you to deliver it to anyone?

Mr. EMMERSON. As I recall it, there was one which had the name of a Japanese in the United States.

Mr. MORRIS. Was that Fujii Shuji?

Mr. EMMERSON. Fujii Shuji.

Mr. MORRIS. He was a Communist.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not know he was a Communist at that time. And when I got back to the State Department, Mr. Eugene Dooman was at that time in the Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs. I had known him in Japan and he is, of course, an outstanding Japanese scholar, so I took these materials and showed them to him and discussed them with him. He then told me there was a unit of OSS, at that time a very highly secret organization, in New York which was doing work on psychological warfare against Japan, and he suggested that I accompany him to New York to visit this unit and take these materials with me, which I did, and I was asked by Mr. Dooman to explain to this group my experiences in China, and these materials which I brought were left, as I recall it, with this group.

I had read all the materials. After all, they were in Japanese and I showed them to Mr. Dooman. It was my impression that he also read them. At any rate, they were left with this group, and I discovered then that this Mr. Fujii, I believe, was an employee of the OSS and a member of that group.

Mr. MORRIS. Senators, for your information in the event that you were not present at the hearing, Mr. Fujii Shuji, the man we are talking about, the subcommittee received evidence that he was a Communist at the time of his work in the OSS, the time referred to. When we asked him about that during the past year he claimed his privilege against incrimination rather than answer the question.

Senator WATKINS. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

And Okano gave you these letters to be delivered to him.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was one letter which contained this platform in Japanese which had his name on it.

Mr. MORRIS. Was there a man named Haga?

A Japanese?

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe so.

Mr. MORRIS. Is he one of the New York group or was he working in OSS?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry, I cannot remember that. I believe Mr. Dooman introduced me to Haga. Mr. Dooman had come in contact with him, and introduced me to him as a Japanese who was working for our war effort.

Mr. MORRIS. How about a man named Tamotsu?

Mr. EMMERSON. I don't recall that name.

Mr. MORRIS. Did Okano give you anything else to bring back to the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. I don't recall that he gave me anything else, except, as I say, these charts, pamphlets, booklets, all of which were illustrative of the kind of effort they were putting forth against the Japanese.

Mr. MORRIS. Did any of these Japanese Communists actually come back from Yenan to Washington?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not as far as I know.

Mr. MORRIS. They ultimately went back to Japan; did they not?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, from Communist China, so far as I know they all went back to Japan.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you aid any of them in going into Japan?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I did not.

Mr. MORRIS. You did not help Okano getting back to Japan?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I did not.

Mr. MORRIS. How did he get back to Japan?

Mr. EMMERSON. That charge that I did help Okano get into Japan was made some years ago and again was taken up in great detail in my hearings before the State Department Loyalty Security Board in 1952, and I was in Japan at the time. Apparently—we are not sure how he got back but it seemed, as I recall from the records, we were able to discover at that time that he may have taken a United States Army plane from Yenan or may have been put on board a United States Army plane and taken into North China.

From there presumably he got to Korea, and I believe he must have had the consent of the American general in charge of our forces in Korea in order to cross the boundary, and then he proceeded and arrived in Japan with great fanfare and publicity, I may say.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you visit in Japan subsequently when you were General MacArthur's aide, the Japanese prisons there? Did you visit the Japanese Communists in their cells?

Mr. EMMERSON. Shortly after I arrived in Japan—this was immediately after the surrender in 1945—we heard that there were some Japanese Communists in a prison camp just outside Tokyo and at that time Mr. Herbert Norman, a Canadian diplomat, was working in the Counter Intelligence Corps. He is a well-known Japanese scholar and speaks Japanese, was born in Japan. He, as I say, was working for Counter Intelligence, and so, under orders of the Counter Intelligence Corps, he and I together, in an Army vehicle, went to the prison camp to find out whether in fact these prisoners were there.

We discovered that they were, that there were two very prominent Japanese Communists, Mr. Shiga and Tokuda. After talking briefly to these prisoners, we returned to headquarters and reported this to the Counter Intelligence Corps.

It was felt that perhaps these prisoners might have some intelligence value that might be worth while interrogating them, so it was ar-

ranged that military cars from the Counter Intelligence Corps should go out the prison, and again Mr. Norman and I went out, since we spoke Japanese.

Prisoners were placed in the cars and were brought back to headquarters where they were interrogated, an official interrogation in the headquarters itself by officers of the Counter Intelligence Corps.

At the end of the interrogation, they were taken back to the prison. That is the complete extent of my association with the interrogation of those prisoners of war or any visits to Japanese prison camps.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you acquainted with Mr. Dooman's testimony to the fact that these Communists were driven around in Tokyo in Army staff cars which was the equivalent of 100,000 votes to the Japanese Communists in their election?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have read that testimony, and all I can say is that the only time the prisoners were ever driven in Army cars was when this group was driven from the prison to the headquarters and back again.

Mr. MORRIS. Were they observed, do you think?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was no reason for them to be observed. They were in khaki-colored Army sedans and they went through the streets of Tokyo, but there was no reason for them to be remarked any more than any other Army cars would have been.

Furthermore, Mr. Dooman, I believe, states that on October 10, I went out in an Army car and liberated these prisoners and drove them to their homes. That is completely false. I was not in the vicinity of the prison on October 10, and at no time ever drove these people to their homes. They were freed under the order of General MacArthur which liberated all political prisoners under the date, I believe, of October 4, 1945, and what happened at the prison at the time of their liberation I am not aware.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you have any knowledge that Mr. Norman, the man you talked about, was a Communist?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had no knowledge whatsoever.

Mr. MORRIS. Senators, we have had testimony in our record that Mr. Norman, who was then the Canadian attached to SCAP Headquarters, a professor of his, a man who was a Communist teacher at the time, has testified that while he was teaching a study group in Columbia, one of his students in this Communist group was E. Herbert Norman, the man we have been talking about. He was the man who made the trip with you at the time. You had, you say, no idea he was a Communist?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had no reason to think he was a Communist either then or now. He is presently Canadian Ambassador to Egypt.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, we have quite a few security reports which have a great deal of information to the effect that he is a Communist. that he was involved—

Senator JENNER. You say he is now Canada's Ambassador to Egypt?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, sir. He has been their Ambassador to New Zealand and is now, I believe. I believe that in 1951 the Canadian Government issued a press release stating that he had been completely cleared of any charges made against him.

Mr. McMANUS. Do you happen to know if he was in Egypt when Donald McLean was over there?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was some years ago; wasn't it?

Mr. McMANUS. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, he just arrived in Egypt the end of October this past year, just recently has gone there.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, would you like to see these documents I am referring to about Herbert Norman and the evidence in the security files that he is a Communist?

I think it would be appropriate at this time.

Senator JENNER. I think so.

Senator WATKINS. You say Herbert Norman is now an Ambassador from Canada to Egypt?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. From Canada to Egypt?

Mr. EMMERSON. He is Canadian Ambassador. As I say, he has been, as far as I know, cleared by the Canadian Government in 1951. I understood that there was a press release to that effect.

Senator WATKINS. I assume he had either been cleared or else they do not know anything about these charges against him if they send him over there now.

Mr. EMMERSON. He went to Japan again, after war I believe, as minister, and then he was in New Zealand as their chief of mission, and as I say, he has just recently been transferred.

Senator JENNER. How recent?

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe it was the end of October.

Senator WATKINS. Of 1956?

Mr. EMMERSON. 1956.

I happen to know because he is also accredited to Lebanon as minister. He is assigned to Cairo and accredited to Lebanon.

Senator WATKINS. Are you and he friends?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have known him since about 1940.

Senator WATKINS. Do you correspond?

Mr. EMMERSON. We do not correspond; no, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know of any effort that was made to have Mr. Norman serve as the official intelligence liaison between Canada and the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I have never heard of that.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know of what I might call a campaign to effect that assignment for him?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I do not.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Norman was also head of the American and Far Eastern desk of the Canadian Foreign Office; was he not?

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe at one time he was; yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you first meet Mr. Norman, Mr. Emmerson?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think about 1940. It was prewar Japan. He was, at that time, at the Canadian Legation in Tokyo when I was at the American Embassy in Tokyo. He was already a well-known writer on Japan, has written a number of books on the Government of Japan. He was born in Japan and speaks Japanese, of course, fluently, and has always been widely known.

Mr. MORRIS. Had he attended Columbia University?

Mr. EMMERSON. I assume so. That I don't know. He was already in the Canadian Foreign Service in 1940, that is the prewar period.

He is well known to anybody who has had anything to do with the Far East, because he has written on the Far East and is a very well-known scholar, but I just say I have no reason to think he was a Communist in my association with him.

Senator WATKINS. Did he ever give any indication in conversations with you that he was pro-Communist?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, not to my recollection. I don't remember any conversation which would indicate that he was a Communist.

Senator WATKINS. At the times you were talking of, was there any suspicion then that the Communists had designs against the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that there was a general lack of understanding of Communist ideology and Communist aims and objectives at this early period. It seems to me the history of the war period and the postwar period shows that there was a good deal of misunderstanding and lack of appreciation of the Communist menace and the Communist aims and objectives, and as long as Russia was in the war with us as an ally, that misunderstanding tended to continue.

Senator WATKINS. Did you ever serve in the underground in France?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, sir, I have not.

Senator WATKINS. Do you have any knowledge of that operation?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, none whatsoever.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a Dr. Chi?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, I do not know him.

Mr. MORRIS. He and Herbert Norman, according to our records were associated, closely associated in Japan.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You never encountered him?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. He had been an American-trained Chinese.

Mr. EMMERSON. Chi? No.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you meet Owen Lattimore in Japan?

Mr. EMMERSON. I met Owen Lattimore.

Mr. MORRIS. He was also close to Norman and Chi.

Mr. EMMERSON. I see.

Mr. MORRIS. What was your experience with Mr. Lattimore?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can't remember when I may have first met him. Again he is another figure who is of course acquainted to anyone who has ever had anything to do with the Far East, his writings and all his associations with the Far East, and I may have seen him before the war on 1 or 2 occasions. He made a trip to Japan after the war. I believe I saw him once.

Mr. MORRIS. What were the circumstances of your seeing him?

Mr. EMMERSON. As I recall it, there was some kind of a dinner at which a number of people were present at the Imperial Hotel. I am sorry, I have a very vague memory of this.

Mr. MORRIS. It was a meeting at the hotel?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was not a meeting. It was a dinner as I recall it. There were a number of people present.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was the host?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry; I can't remember.

Mr. MORRIS. And you can't remember who the people were that were there?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Senator JENNER. Was Norman there?

Mr. EMMERSON. I just have a recollection of seeing Mr. Lattimore.

Senator JENNER. Was Norman there?

Mr. EMMERSON. I don't believe he was but, again, I am not sure.

Mr. MORRIS. Subsequently you had an assignment in Moscow, did you not, Mr. Emmerson?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Were there ever any security charges brought up in Moscow against you?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was one incident involving a document which disappeared. I was the one who discovered the fact that a document was missing. I reported it immediately to my superiors in the Embassy, and a search was made.

The Ambassador at that time, General Bedell Smith, made an investigation, wrote a report about this to the State Department which is in the files.

Mr. MORRIS. And you don't know what happened to the document?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know a Gen. Patrick Hurley at all?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. What were your experiences with General Hurley?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, he, as you may recall, was first sent out to China as a special representative of the President in the fall of 1944, and I believe I first met him in Chungking. I was in Yenan at the time he made one of his visits to Communist China. He came up in the fall, I believe in November of 1944, to discuss with the Communists the matter of coalition or union with the Nationalist Government, and I was present in Yenan at that time. I met him again of course in Chungking a number of times, and I believe once in Washington after I had returned from China.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I read this into the record because I think it is appropriate?

Senator JENNER. Yes, proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. In an indirect way, if you will understand, Mr. Emerson. We are interested in the whole area, and as was made very clear, in no way are you here as an adverse personality but we are trying to learn from you the whole thing.

This is a security report, Senator, and as you know, in security reports, very often the identity of the sources of the information are not known.

I do know that as far as Mr. Norman is concerned, that there was this direct testimony by Professor Wittfogel, who is an outstanding Chinese scholar, that Norman was a student of his in a Communist group in Columbia while he was a professor there.

Later when we looked into it we further learned that Herbert Norman was the secretary of an organization which was called the American Friends of the Chinese People, which was also a Communist organization, and they formed a Canadian affiliate called the Canadian Friends of the Chinese People, and Norman was the executive secretary.

I thought that very significant because, on these Communist-front organizations, Senator, generally the executive secretary is someone

they can trust. But then, in the course of time, we have learned some of these things and I would like to read a few paragraphs from this.

Mr. MORRIS [reading] :

Dr. Norman, as was pointed out, is an outstanding Japanese scholar, a linguist, historian and authority on contemporary Japanese politics and affairs in general.

Among his recent Japanese associates are Tsuru Shigeto—

Do you know Mr. Tsuru by any chance?

Mr. EMMERSON. I met him in Tokyo.

Mr. MORRIS. He is in Japan now; is he not?

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe he is in the United States now.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Where is he?

Mr. EMMERSON. Harvard University, I believe.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Yes; that is right.

Mr. MORRIS. He is not working with the State Department; is he?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. He is on some kind of a fellowship or a year's service out there in some connection.

Mr. McMANUS. He was attached to SCAP.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS [reading] :

(Counsel then read from a United States Government executive agency security report which indicated that Dr. E. Herbert Norman had been recalled from Japan when his Government discovered certain Communist connections, specifically with Israel Halperin, a Canadian citizen of Russian parentage, who was one of the principals implicated in the exposed Soviet military intelligence operation in Canada.)

You will remember, Senator Jenner, when you tried to have Gouzenko testify, that the Canadian authorities would not let you ask any questions whatever about anyone who was a Canadian personality.

(Counsel Morris continued the reading.)

When Tsuru Shigato, Japanese instructor at Harvard, was apprehended for repatriation purposes in 1942, the FBI was approached by Norman who represented himself as an official on highly confidential business of the Canadian Government in an effort to take custody of Tsuru's belongings.

One main item of these belongings was a complete record of the Nye munitions investigations, largely prepared by Alger Hiss.

Norman later admitted to the FBI agents in charge that his was only a personal interest, and that he was not representing the Canadian Government as stated.

Another item among these belongings, as reported by the FBI, was a letter dated May 9, 1937, which related to a series of studies being promoted at Harvard by Tsuru which provided for the study of American capitalists from a Marxist viewpoint. The studies were conducted by a group of young instructors and graduate students which had met five times. They discussed certain papers which included American Imperialism, by E. H. Norman.

The report further indicated that Norman was identified in February of 1940 as a member of the Communist Party.

One of the witnesses at the marriage of Norman to Laura Irene Clark on August 31, 1935, was one C. P. H. Holmes who has been identified as Charles P. H. Holmes, born in Japan in 1910 and known as a Communist and active in the Communist underground in Ottawa.

It goes on with quite a bit more about Herbert Norman. This is all in connection with an inquiry that there was an effort being made to have Norman given the assignment of being liaison between Canada and the United States Intelligence.

The association with Norman is something we would like to know as much as we can about. Can you tell us something about it?

It would seem from that that he is an important personality.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can—

Mr. MORRIS. The other thing, Mr. Emmerson, is that the Japanese Communist Party today, the main blood, is supplied by the Japanese prisoners who have been trained by Communists in Siberia and sent back into Japan. Senator Jenner, I think it was, who took the testimony, that the NKVD man who recruited most of them has now been sent into Japan after they preceded him, and they are now making up the Communist underground.

So all this activity of Norman with the Japanese prisoners is of great interest to the subcommittee.

So we feel that you should be able to tell us great deal about this.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can say again that my prewar association with Norman was a social one, that we met occasionally and we knew each other.

We both had interests in Japan, in Japanese culture, history and literature.

The second time I met him was in Tokyo in postwar Japan when he was, as I say, a member of the Counter Intelligence.

Now he had a great knowledge of Japanese history, of Japanese politics, of Japanese political parties. One would describe him, as far as his conversations with me were concerned, as one with liberal ideas.

In searching my memory I simply cannot recall any statements, any conversations of his which would lead me to the conclusion that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you last see him? When did you last see Norman?

Mr. EMMERSON. He came to Beirut to present his credentials, and I saw him very briefly on about October the 27th, I guess.

Senator JENNER. This last year, 1956?

Mr. EMMERSON. This last year, that is right. He was accredited to Lebanon.

Senator JENNER. He presented his credentials at Beirut?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right, as Canadian Minister, although he is resident in Cairo.

Senator WATKINS. He serves in dual capacity, Minister to one country and Ambassador to the other?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And there is nothing more about Norman?

Mr. EMMERSON. I would be glad to give you any information I possibly might have. As I say, I have known him only as a person who is a well-known Japanese scholar and a person who is intelligent and was well thought of as far as his scholastic connections were concerned.

Senator JENNER. In October when you saw him in Beirut when he came to present his credentials, did you have dinner with him or did you visit with him at any length?

Mr. EMMERSON. Very briefly, because I was leaving the same day for the United States.

Senator JENNER. Did he pass any opinion upon the problems confronting the world in the Middle East at that time?

This was in October 1956?

Mr. EMMERSON. He was extremely concerned about the developments in the Middle East, about the danger of an explosion taking place.

As a matter of fact, I believe that this outbreak occurred while he was in Beirut and he was delayed in getting back to Cairo.

Senator JENNER. Which outbreak now do you refer to?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am referring to the Israeli invasion at the end of October, and the British and French action.

Senator WATKINS. Did he go back there before the trouble?

Mr. EMMERSON. He could not leave because no one could go to Cairo. After the invasion had taken place there was no plane service between Beirut and Cairo. I am not sure how long he had to stay there, but no one could go from Beirut to Cairo.

Senator WATKINS. You left the same day that he came?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. What were your duties in Beirut?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am deputy chief of mission there, consular embassy.

Senator WATKINS. Is that in effect a deputy Ambassador?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right. That is the No. 2 position in the Embassy.

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Senator JENNER. Did he criticize our country for the attitude we took on the English and French invasion?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; because that had not taken place.

Senator JENNER. That was not discussed?

Mr. EMMERSON. The British and French invasion had not taken place when I saw him. As I recall it, we discussed the general situation in the Middle East.

Senator JENNER. I thought you were referring to the outbreak when Israel broke into the Sinai Desert and so forth and at the same time, as I recall it, and I may be wrong, the French and British moved into Suez.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I recall the chronology, that did not happen until about the 30th or the 31st of October. I was in London, in fact I was in the House of Commons on the 30th, which was the day Prime Minister Eden presented his ultimatum, so that he did not know, at least in Beirut, about the Israeli—in fact, I think that mobilization in Israel had taken place, but we had not got that news yet when I left Beirut.

Senator JENNER. So that matter was not discussed?

Mr. EMMERSON. That matter was not discussed.

Senator JENNER. Do you recall what you did talk about?

Mr. EMMERSON. The general situation, and I am sure that we did discuss the general situation in the Middle East, and our concern about developments and about the dangers to western interests in the Middle East.

I am sorry I cannot recall any specific statements that he may have made, but there was certainly nothing which would excite my curiosity or which would strike me as being strange or being pro-Communist.

I am sure that I would have remembered any statement of that sort.

Mr. MORRIS. You said you met him briefly and shortly, I forget which was your expression.

How long would that be?

Mr. EMMERSON. He and his wife stopped by our house.

Mr. MORRIS. You said briefly or shortly, whatever the expression was.

Mr. EMMERSON. For 2 hours, something of that sort.

Senator JENNER. He knew that you were there?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Senator JENNER. How did he know that?

Mr. EMMERSON. I assume that he learned it from friends. I don't know how he knew that I was there.

Senator JENNER. He ascertained your address and came by your home with his wife?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator JENNER. How long did he stay?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 2 hours.

Senator JENNER. You have not been corresponding at all?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; we have never corresponded.

Senator JENNER. In other words, he had to get your address from some other official or some mutual friend?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator JENNER. And you have many mutual friends, I take it?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; we have many mutual friends because we both served in Japan, and anybody who has served in the Far East knows other people who have served in the Far East, and as I say, if I had had any reason to suspect that he was a pro-Communist I would have noticed it or I would have been conscious of it.

Senator WATKINS. Was there any indication in your 2-hour visit with him in Beirut that he was sympathetic with the Communists?

Mr. EMMERSON. None whatsoever, absolutely none.

Senator WATKINS. If he is a Communist, secretly a Communist, he certainly has not any business being a representative of the Canadian Government. Of course I would assume that the Canadian Government, being probably just as much opposed to communism as we are, would take very effective measures to determine whether he was or was not.

Any man would have the right to assume, until the contrary was shown, that he was not a Communist, because of the well-known attitude of Canada with respect to communism and their close relationship with us in this fight in the cold war.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

As I said before, I do know that when some question came up in 1952, we discovered that there had been a press release, I believe in 1951, issued by the Canadian Government which stated that charges had been made against Mr. Norman and that he had been completely cleared.

Of course I have no further knowledge about his relations with the Canadian Government or any subsequent investigations and clearances which may have taken place.

Senator WATKINS. You are married, I take it?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am married; yes, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Do his wife and your wife correspond?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; they do not correspond.

Senator JENNER. Did he say anything about the reasons why he happened to be assigned to the Middle East at that particular time, whether or not he was pleased or displeased by it?

Mr. EMMERSON. He was very pleased, extremely pleased. He had been in New Zealand for I don't know how long, maybe 2 years or more, and I know he had very recently come to Cairo.

As I recall it, he mentioned his starting to study Arabic and he was quite a linguist and had read a great many books on Egypt, on the Near East. He was intensely interested in the situation in Egypt, in the Nasser regime and what was going to come out of all this. That is the sort of thing that I recall being discussed.

Senator JENNER. Proceed, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you last see Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose I left Japan in February 1946. It was some time before then.

Mr. MORRIS. You have not seen him since?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. You have not corresponded with him?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Solomon Adler in the Far East?

Mr. EMMERSON. I met him in Chungking. He was the Treasury attaché in 1944.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you see much of him at that time?

Mr. EMMERSON. From time to time. The American colony was small there. I saw him on 2 or 3 occasions.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the nature of the association that you had with him, was it all on an official basis?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. No private meetings?

Mr. EMMERSON. No private meetings. I say I may have seen him socially once or twice, dinner.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you last see Mr. Fujii?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Fujii I only saw one time in my life which was this time when Mr. Dooman took me to New York. I had never seen him before and I have never seen him since.

Mr. MORRIS. Just one other thing.

You mentioned mutual friends of Norman. Who were those mutual friends?

Mr. EMMERSON. Other people in the Canadian diplomatic service, I mean people in our service who had served in Japan. Mr. John Holmes, who was the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Canada and who is a friend of mine and whom I knew in Moscow and whom I have seen a great deal of at the United Nations General Assembly sessions.

We have spoken of Mr. Norman on a number of occasions certainly.

Mr. MORRIS. I think we have covered, Senators, the information that is in our public record with respect to Mr. Emmerson.

Senator WATKINS. Is there anything else that you want to ask him about?

Do you have any other information?

Mr. MORRIS. I will tell you, Senator, this was all prepared just within the framework of our going over what was in our public record. I have made it clear, Senator, this is not an adverse proceeding. We are not investigating Mr. Emmerson, but these things are in our record

and we feel our record won't be complete unless we ask him about them. I think I have covered the important points that are in our records.

If you can think of anything in our record that you would like to address yourself to—

Mr. EMMERSON. If I could just say a few words about my subsequent service.

Senator JENNER. You may.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to say that I have already stated that when I came back from China in 1945 I had already begun to learn a little more about communism and about the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party.

I specifically, in 1945, sought out Mr. Ray Murphy, whom you gentlemen may know as a Soviet expert in the Department of State, and we discussed the matter at length.

He was extremely interested in my experience in Communist China, and I was interested in talking with him. He gave me a number of materials on communism which I read. All of this again is a matter of record in testimony which was given in 1952.

Mr. Murphy testified in person at my hearing. In 1947 I was assigned to Moscow and I had 2 years experience in the Soviet Union which I think is the best course one can have in the practice of Soviet communism.

Certainly in all of the period of my service since the war, I have been in positions where the Communist menace has been one of our primary considerations.

I served for 2½ years in Pakistan and I was chargé d'affaires in Karachi for a period of more than 8 months, and I happened to be chargé d'affaires when we signed the Military Aid Agreement with Pakistan. My signature is on that agreement as well as that of the Foreign Minister.

I was extremely interested in the development of the Northern Tier concept.

Senator WATKINS. Did you take part in those negotiations?

Mr. EMMERSON. I took part in the negotiations in Karachi.

Senator WATKINS. Did you work with Mr. Dulles?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Dulles visited Karachi while I was there in 1953.

Senator WATKINS. Who carried the burden of those negotiations?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had been chargé d'affaires between Ambassadors. Ambassador Warren left in November of 1952, and Ambassador Hildreth did not take charge of the Embassy until August of 1953, so that I was in charge of the Embassy during that period, and whatever negotiations took place in Karachi I was the one who took charge of those negotiations.

Senator WATKINS. How old are you?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am 49. I will be 49 the 17th of March.

Senator WATKINS. How long have you been in service?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been in the service since 1935.

Senator WATKINS. You would have been about 28 when you were in China?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. I would say this: It seems to me that if there is any suspicion about you whatsoever they certainly entrusted you

with some very important matters in connection with the building up of the SEATO Pact.

Mr. EMMERSON. From Karachi I went to Beirut and certainly we in Lebanon believe that that is one of the most important posts in the Near East.

Everything comes in and out of Lebanon, and Lebanon is the mirror, the reflection of the political events.

Senator JENNER. When did you go to Beirut?

Mr. EMMERSON. In 1955; I went in May of 1955.

Senator JENNER. 1955. After you left Karachi where was your service?

Mr. EMMERSON. To Beirut, from Karachi I went directly to Beirut.

Senator JENNER. I misunderstood.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was in Karachi from October of 1952 until May of 1955.

Senator JENNER. I see.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then I went to Beirut. I was again in charge of the Embassy for more than 6 months while the Ambassador attended the United Nations. That was the period of the Soviet arms deal with Egypt. It was a period of great tension in the Middle East when we were extremely concerned with the Soviet penetration which had already started, and has been extremely active and very evident even in a country such as Lebanon.

Senator WATKINS. Did you know Cavendish Cannon?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. How well?

Mr. EMMERSON. I never served with him, but I saw him last in Athens about a year ago.

Senator WATKINS. Just about a year before he was transferred over?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. I also knew him in the Department when he was serving on the policy planning staff. That was a period when I was the policy planning adviser for Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs and had a good deal to do with the Policy Planning Board, appeared frequently there and got well acquainted with Ambassador Cannon at that time.

Senator WATKINS. You know him quite well?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator JENNER. If there are no further questions, I will admonish everyone here that this is an executive session and this session was held for the purposes Mr. Morris explained, to complete our record on these very important matters, and we thank you for appearing here, Mr. Emmerson.

Mr. EMMERSON. Thank you, sir.

(Whereupon, at 3:30 p. m., the subcommittee was adjourned.)

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

The following testimony was made public March 28, 1957, by resolution of the subcommittee.

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1957

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER
INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator Arthur V. Watkins presiding.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; J. G. Sourwine, associate counsel; William A. Rusher, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; Robert McManus, investigations analyst.

Senator WATKINS. The committee will come to order.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, the witness has been sworn.

Senator WATKINS. In a previous session?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, Senator. He has come back to make certain changes in the record here today, Senator.

Senator WATKINS. All right.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN K. EMMERSON, DEPUTY CHIEF OF MISSION AND COUNSELOR OF EMBASSY, BEIRUT, LEBANON—Resumed

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Emmerson, what changes would you like to have made in this record that you made?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, may I just say that after the session, first, I realized immediately I had made a mistake in dates, in saying that I had left Beirut on the same day that I had the meeting with Mr. Norman. I believe I mentioned that to Judge Morris after the session.

The fact is I left Beirut on October 28, and I saw Mr. Norman on October 27.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, you say you told me that before, Mr. Emmerson?

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe I mentioned to you in the corridor, right after the session—that I had recognized there was a mistake in date, and that I had not left Beirut on the same day as my meeting with Mr. Norman, but on the succeeding day, and I verified that with my personal records.

The other point is that, after I began to think over the testimony which I had given with respect to this meeting, I recognized that I had not given some of the details which would fill in the circumstances of the meeting, and therefore I wish to have the opportunity to amplify, in order that there be no mistaken impression about the meeting.

In the first place, I was asked whether I had ever corresponded with Mr. Norman, and I said that I had not.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

I think on page 2045 of the official transcript, Senator, Mr. Emerson was asked by Senator Jenner: "You have not been corresponding at all?"—and Mr. Emerson said, "No, we have never corresponded."

Now, you want to make a change in that?

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say that it is true we have never carried on any correspondence. But I would just like to make two points so there is no mistaken impression.

In the first place, I think the Normans are on our Christmas card list, and I believe we have exchanged Christmas cards.

In the second place, I completely forgot at the meeting that I had received a letter from him in the spring of 1956, written from Wellington, New Zealand, saying he expected to be transferred to Cairo, and that he looked forward to seeing me in Beirut.

To the best of my recollection, I acknowledged that letter and said that I would be happy to see him when he came to Beirut and hoped that he would spend considerable time there during the course of his duties.

Then, I would like to give a little more of the details with respect to my seeing him on October 27. I do not know how he first learned that I was in Beirut, but I assume that he had learned it from colleagues.

I may say also that at the same time, either before or after the letter from Mr. Norman, I received another letter from Mr. Brewster Morris, who is a Foreign Service officer, and who was detailed as an inspector in New Zealand, at that time, saying he and his wife had met the Normans, and that the Normans were coming to Cairo and would also be coming to Beirut.

Mr. MORRIS. Did he say when?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think he may have said after home leave, within a few months, because I believe the Normans proceeded to Canada and spent some time there before they arrived in Beirut—I mean, in Cairo—and I am not sure that they did not arrive in Cairo.

But may I say that the Canadian Legation in Beirut is normally in charge of a resident Chargé d'Affaires, the Minister living in Cairo. The present Chargé d'Affaires is Mr. Lionel Roy—R-o-y—and, of course, I see him very frequently at diplomatic functions, both officially and socially. So that I learned from him that Mr. and Mrs. Norman were arriving by ship on the morning of October 27.

Then, when I found out that I had orders to come back to the United States for the United Nations and would be leaving on the 28th, I mentioned to Mr. Roy that I had known the Normans before and that we would be happy to see them, if it were possible, on the day of the 27th. And I believe that on probably the 26th I sent a note to Mr. Roy, and whether I enclosed a note to Mr. Norman inside or not, I cannot remember.

In any case, I suggested that the Normans drop by our house for lunch, if possible, on the day of October 27th.

So that, during the morning of the 27th, we received word by telephone or note, I cannot remember—and also, my wife may have gone

to the boat that morning, although that I cannot verify. She is in Beirut.

In any case, we received word that they would come by, and they did at about 1 o'clock. We live in a penthouse apartment, and we showed them around the apartment, and we had cocktails, we had lunch, and they left, I think about 3 o'clock.

Now, I just wanted to be completely sure that the details of this meeting were clarified so that there would not be any miscomprehension about the nature of the occasion, which was entirely a social one.

And so far as my conversation with Mr. Norman is concerned, it is generally as I reported it the other day. I cannot recall any significant points in the conversation. I do remember that he referred to his clearance in 1951, and that he referred to the fact that he had supplied an affidavit with respect to this interrogation of Japanese prisoners of war, which I spoke about to the committee the other day.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean, you discussed the clearance at that session?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was mentioned, yes; that is right. And I got the impression from him that as far as he was concerned, he assumed that the matter was closed and there would be no further developments.

I may say it has been about 10 years since I had seen Mr. Norman before this occasion in Beirut.

Senator WATKINS. How well did you know him when you were in Japan?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I knew him fairly well in the period from September of 1945 until February of 1946, because, as I said before, he was in the counter intelligence section, working on Japanese affairs, and I was in the political adviser's office. We had a great many—

Senator WATKINS. Well, now, was he in the same service that you were in?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; he was lent by the Canadian Government to SCAP, to MacArthur's headquarters, to the counter intelligence section of MacArthur's headquarters.

Senator WATKINS. And you were working in that same—

Mr. EMMERSON. No. I was in the political adviser's office, but also attached to MacArthur's headquarters. We were in two separate sections, but both under the direction of General MacArthur, of SCAP.

Senator WATKINS. Well, how closely were you associated in those duties?

Mr. EMMERSON. We were associated because we were working on similar projects. That is, you may recall that in the first months of the occupation, the whole emphasis was on determining the individuals who had been responsible for the prosecution of the war, and on ferreting out the organizations which had contributed to the war.

The war crime trials were in the process of preparation, and the headquarters was engaged in carrying out what was known as the purge directive, in which all those persons who had occupied positions of leadership in Japan, which had prosecuted the war, were purged from public office.

So that the Counter Intelligence Corps, naturally, had considerable duties with respect to reporting on political developments and on individuals.

I, as a member of the political adviser's office, had the responsibility, which was by specific directive of General MacArthur, to write a weekly report on political party developments in Japan, which meant that it was necessary for me to find out as much as I could about the different political personalities and the different parties, from the right to the left.

So that, because of the similarity of our duties, and the fact that both of us spoke Japanese, we did come into very frequent contact.

Senator WATKINS. Well, you had known each other previously?

Mr. EMMERSON. We had known each other previously; that is right.

Senator WATKINS. Well, now, you know about the testimony of Mr. Dooman?

Mr. EMMERSON. With respect to the prisoner-of-war interrogation; that is right.

Senator WATKINS. And the fact that these prisoners of war had been paraded through the streets?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I think I spoke of that the other day in the hearing.

Senator WATKINS. You said the statement of Mr. Dooman, about certain elements of that, was completely false?

Mr. EMMERSON. The fact that we were supposed to have liberated prisoners of war and driven them to their homes, that is false. I did not participate in any operation of that sort.

I think that his testimony arises out of a misunderstanding of what was an official interrogation operation. And the only association I had with that was two trips to the prison, the first one to find out whether indeed there were political prisoners. I may say here these were not all Communists; part of them were Communists, part were members of religious sects, other organizations, that had been in prison for political reasons.

We then returned to headquarters and reported the fact that these individuals were there. The suggestion was made that they be brought to headquarters for interrogation, and that order was given by General Thorpe, who was in charge of counterintelligence.

Senator WATKINS. Were you carrying out those orders to bring them up there?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. Who did you take up there to the headquarters?

Mr. EMMERSON. You mean, the names of the prisoners?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can only recall the names of two, Tokuda—T-o-k-u-d-a—and Shiga, S-h-i-g-a—who were very prominent, well-known Japanese Communists. There were others there who were not labeled as Communists. I have forgotten exactly the names. I think there may have been 4 or 5 individuals who were interrogated.

Now, those interrogations were conducted in headquarters by officers of headquarters. Mr. Norman and I participated, since we both spoke Japanese, and it was felt more desirable to have interrogations by Americans, or Mr. Norman, who was a Canadian, but was assigned to headquarters, than nisei—that is, the second-generation Japanese.

Reports of all those interrogations were, of course, made to the headquarters and are a matter of record.

Senator WATKINS. Well, now, let me ask you: Did Mr. Dooman have any part in this activity?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, Mr. Dooman was not in Japan, and I think he so testified—that this information had come to him from second- or third-hand sources. He was not in Japan at that time.

Senator WATKINS. He was not in a position to see what went on?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; he was not in a position to see.

Senator WATKINS. Had no active connection with it whatsoever, as far as you are concerned?

Mr. EMMERSON. As far as I am concerned, he had no active connection with it whatsoever. He was not in Japan, and I believe he so states in his testimony.

Senator WATKINS. I have not read his testimony for a long time, and I do not remember what he said.

I noticed in your statement you called to the attention of the witness that Mr. Dooman said that he was—

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Dooman said he had not been there, and he heard it after he arrived in Japan.

And I think the two Japanese Communists who had been liberated have written about this episode in a book, haven't they?

Mr. EMMERSON. They have; that is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you remember what they said in that book?

Mr. EMMERSON. I recall, I believe, Shiga wrote a book—and a quotation is included in Mr. Dooman's testimony—and he mentions the fact that their first contact with the outside world after the end of the war was with the 2 or 3 correspondents—an American, Mr. Harold Isaacs, and two others were French. Their names I cannot recall.

And he said they came to the prison and talked to him. Then he said next, I believe he says—he mentions my name, I believe—he mentions Mr. Emmerson, Mr. Norman, and Lieutenant Colonel Davis came. And he does not describe this interrogation in the headquarters, and he does not say, so far as I recall he does not say, anything about our liberating them or driving them to their homes—any thing of that sort.

Now, I have refreshed my memory on the dates. The directive—General MacArthur's directive which liberated all political prisoners and established freedom of speech and press, and so on, was issued on October 4, 1945. As I recall, our first visit to the prison was on October 5, after the directive had been issued.

And Shiga says something in his book, that "Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Norman told us about the policies of SCAP," and Mr. Dooman seems to put some special significance to that.

Well, the policies of SCAP had been published, they were on the radio the night before, and were in the papers that morning with this directive. So that if we told them about that, we were telling them something which had been published.

So that I do not believe there is any mystery about this operation. It was fully documented in the headquarters of SCAP, and I wrote a special to the State Department about it describing it in detail, and including copies of the interrogations in which I participated.

Mr. MORRIS. That is your testimony, Mr. Emmerson; you did not bring the Japanese Communists in staff cars, you did not drive them in staff cars?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not drive them. Now, they were brought from the prison to the headquarters in staff cars.

Mr. MORRIS. You did not accompany them?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was in one of the cars when it came back.

Senator WATKINS. How many, would you say, were brought up to headquarters?

Mr. EMMERSON. As I recall it, maybe 5, 5 or 6.

Senator WATKINS. These prisoners were all together?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Were they all Communists?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not believe so. I think that about three were Communists, and maybe one was Korean. Whether he was a Korean Communist or not, I do not recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you remember his name?

Mr. EMMERSON. Kim—I cannot remember exactly.

I think there was another one who belonged to one of these sects which had been outlawed by the Japanese.

Senator WATKINS. Well, now, with reference to Mr. Norman, I think this committee wants to know, and the country wants to know, at least the representatives of the country charged with the responsibility, if there is anything about his conduct that would indicate that he was a Communist and was working on behalf of the Communist nations, or the Communist conspiracy as they sometimes call it.

I assume you would be just as interested, as a loyal American, in finding that out and giving us any information that you would have.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. Any information with respect to his conduct that might indicate that he was not what he pretended to be.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; I certainly would.

Senator WATKINS. Can you think of anything now in your relationship with him that would indicate that he was not loyal to his country, or loyal to the free nations of the world?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have thought a great deal, naturally, about my associations with him and about the conversations I have had with him.

I can recall one conversation in Tokyo, which for some reason has stuck in my mind, which I had in the meantime forgotten.

We were interviewing a Japanese, and—I cannot remember his name—I believe he was a Socialist, a member of one of the factions of the Japanese Socialist Party. He was not identified as a Communist. Of course, one can never be sure whether a person is a Communist or not. But as I recall it, he declared himself to be a Socialist, and he was giving us a history of the Japanese Socialist movement and its various factions and the personalities involved.

And I recall at one point in the conversation that Mr. Norman made some statement which appeared to agree with the general thesis which this man was proposing. I have tried to reconstruct this conversation, and I do not believe I can be any more specific.

I know that it struck me, because it never occurred to me, in any interview with a member of any political party, to express any view whatsoever concerning what he was saying. I mean, I have had association with a great many people of all political hues, and it never would occur to me to express agreement with some political view which the other individual is pointing out.

And I do remember that one occasion, when this struck me as being unusual. But it did not indicate to me that Mr. Norman was a member of the Communist Party, or that he was a Communist.

I have said in my testimony that he seemed to be a person of "liberal ideas"—you have to put that in quotation marks—he was interested in leftwing movements in Japan.

Again, I say that during that period the entire emphasis was on finding out what the rightwing people were doing, and that the shift to an interest in communism occurred, I think, in 1946, or in the early part of 1946.

Senator WATKINS. Now, this matter of your relationship with Dr. Norman has been gone into, has it not, in the hearings that were held in the State Department?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; in 1952.

Senator WATKINS. Did they go into that very fully?

Mr. EMMERSON. They went into it—

Senator WATKINS. Completely?

Mr. EMMERSON. Fairly completely.

As I said then, and as I have said now, I am sure that if there had been any incident or expression of his which indicated that he was a member of the Communist Party, or that he was a Communist, I certainly would have noticed it, and, of course, it would have been my duty to report it.

Senator WATKINS. Now, going back to this visit you had with him and his wife in Beirut—

Mr. EMMERSON. In Beirut; that is right.

Senator WATKINS. What did you talk about? Can you recall what the substance of your conversation was during the period of time that he was visiting at your home?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, in addition to the usual amenities and discussion of our posts in the meantime, since we had not seen each other for about 10 years, I can recall that we did discuss the general situation in the Middle East. And he had been in Cairo only a short time, and had therefore very brief experience in the Middle East.

I cannot remember any specific opinions of his which would have struck me as being unusual.

I know that several weeks previous to this meeting I had met Mr. Joseph Fromm, who was a correspondent for U. S. News & World Report in Beirut. He had just come from Cairo. He had seen Ambassador Norman, whom he had known in the Far East, and he mentioned to me that Mr. Norman, with his usual scholarly interest, had already learned a great deal about the Arab world, that he had read widely in the literature of the Near East, and that he already had a very broad knowledge of the background of the Arab world. He did not mention anything or indicate any expression which would have borne on this problem of Mr. Norman's Communist sympathies.

Senator WATKINS. You did get into a conversation about the charge that had been made against Mr. Norman, did you not?

Mr. EMMERSON. Since we had not seen each other for about 10 years, and he had furnished this affidavit with respect to the prisoner of war interrogation, that was mentioned.

Senator WATKINS. Well, you see, as I understand, both you and Mr. Norman have been under some criticism, the subject of some criticism—

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. Because of the charge that you were either a Communist, or had been favoring the Communist cause, or had similar views to the Communists. The whole subject had been investigated, both in the United States with respect to you, and in Canada with respect to Mr. Norman?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. Now, you did have a conversation about that situation, didn't you?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. He mentioned the fact that there had been charges made against him, that he had gone through quite a period of investigation, and that he had been cleared and that he assumed the situation was closed.

Senator WATKINS. Did he say anything to you about charges that had been made by Professor Wittfogel?

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, Professor Wittfogel did not make any charges. He was testifying.

Senator WATKINS. I mean, a statement made that Dr. Norman, as a young student, had been a member of a Communist cell at Columbia University?

Mr. MORRIS. The professor was a teacher of—

Senator WATKINS. Yes; he was a teacher of the group. And he was in the cell with him, wasn't he?

Mr. MORRIS. No; he had been a Communist, and when he came to the United States, because he was such a specialist and the Communists still considered him very favorably, they used him to teach their young groups, young Communist groups, on Far Eastern affairs.

Senator WATKINS. Well, I have not reviewed the testimony recently, only what mention was made the other day—

Mr. MORRIS. He said expressly, Senator—we asked him at great length and with great precision whether or not, in fact, Norman was at that time a member of the Communist Party, and he said in great detail, yes, he was.

Senator WATKINS. Now, was Professor Wittfogel a member of the Communist cell himself?

Mr. MORRIS. No; he was the teacher that the Communists assigned to teach the cell.

Senator WATKINS. I realize that, but was he at any time a member of that cell?

Mr. MORRIS. He was a professor; he was not in the cell. It was a cell of students.

Senator WATKINS. The reason was, I wanted to find out the basis of his knowledge, just what he did know about it, and how much was hearsay and how much was his own knowledge.

Mr. MORRIS. He was the teacher that went to the cell; he was the one who taught the group, day to day or week to week, whenever meetings were held.

Senator WATKINS. Well, I will have to go back to his testimony. But I want to be sure about this, because it was rather a grave charge, and, since we have not had the man who was named before us, we have had to rely pretty much on what the professor said about it.

Mr. MORRIS. The only thing, Senator, is that, since this is a record, I would not like the record to show this was a charge, because Professor Wittfogel is a very distinguished professor, and he was here under subpoena, responding to questions. So he was not making charges; he was answering the questions of the subcommittee.

Senator WATKINS. I referred to it in the sense that a man would say, "This man is a Communist," and "So-and-so is a Communist." When you say that, that is in effect making a charge, under modern conditions and under the general feeling of the public.

Mr. MORRIS. But, on behalf of his academic career, I think the record should indicate—

Senator WATKINS. Maybe so. Maybe there is a distinction.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I also think it is appropriate at this time to mention that I have since spoken to Professor Wittfogel, since last week, and he said that to this day no official of the Canadian Government has ever called him up or asked him whether or not any of his testimony was, in fact, accurate.

Senator WATKINS. I see. Well, that is very interesting. It may have some significance.

Mr. MORRIS. In connection with that, did he ever say—that is, Mr. Norman—in connection with his conversation that he had with you, did he say that he had been asked whether or not he had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not recall that he said that. I think he spoke in very general terms about charges having been made against him, and it was his attitude that these were completely unfounded charges and that he had gone through a period of investigation and been cleared. And I cannot specifically remember that he mentioned Professor Wittfogel's name.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, in that connection, we asked the State Department if the decision of the Canadian Government ever was—the communication from the Canadian Government ever was to the effect that they discovered that Norman had been a Communist and that he is no longer one. The Department has informed us that that has never been the effect of any advice given to them by the Canadian Government.

It would be two entirely different things, Senator, if the answer was "Yes; he was a Communist, but he has reformed." That would be very different from saying, "No; this was never true."

Because, if it is the latter, then it means that this security memorandum—I understand that the State Department has now asked the FBI for this particular information, and apparently the FBI information that they have given them does confirm the security report that we put in the record.

So, if it is the latter, Senator, not only would they be saying Professor Wittfogel's testimony was false; they would be saying that this FBI information that has been delivered to the State Department is, by the same token, false—which is entirely different.

Senator WATKINS. Of course, the FBI had to talk to people. They do not get this, ordinarily, from documents or circumstances alone; they get it from humans. And these people are the original source of the testimony, the evidence, and not the FBI. So we have to draw on the conclusion that it is still passing on hearsay evidence.

But that is neither here nor there. We are not trying anybody in this type of a proceeding.

However, we certainly ought to get whatever information we can that would help our own country and its actions with another nation. What we do about it after we get that information—how we handle it, and so on—that is another matter, entirely a different matter. But there is no reason why we should not get as much information as we can, and that is the reason I am querying you about this; to see if there is anything about his conduct that would indicate to you in any way that he was not loyal to his own country—that he was friendly to the Communist group, or to the Communist philosophy, or to Russia.

Now, that is what we are trying to find out. And, of course, I think it would be your full duty to disclose anything you would know of that matter, because it is your own Government now, and Norman's Government, asking for that information, if you have it. And you can understand, can you not, that some suspicion would be aroused by reason of the fact that you had both been under some of these charges, and that you met in Beirut and had a rather—you said it was brief, but depending on the way you look at it—you had a conversation, a rather lengthly conversation, with him, 2 hours or more that he was at your home.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure that I was alert and cautious during this conversation, and that, if anything had occurred or any statement had been made which was unusual, I would have noticed it.

As far as meeting him is concerned, I believe it was in the normal course of one's social duties. We, of course, meet a great many people, diplomats of other countries, in the course of our duties in the Embassy, and since I had known him previously, and was leaving the next day, it would have been normal to have met them on that occasion.

Now, I am sure that he called on the Ambassador later on, and that there must have been a great many associations during that period he was in Beirut after I left.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I think I broke in on a question of yours a while ago, when you asked him if he discussed Professor Wittfogel at all.

Senator WATKINS. Yes; I wanted to find out if he said anything about any testimony Professor Wittfogel had given with respect to him.

Mr. EMMERSON. I just cannot remember that he mentioned Dr. Wittfogel. It was in the context of general charges which had been brought against him, and I just cannot remember whether Dr. Wittfogel's name was mentioned.

Mr. MORRIS. Would it have been logical, Mr. Emmerson, if two old friends met, and there has been this public testimony by a college professor that he had been a teacher of a Communist study group, that that might have been discussed specifically?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I do not believe, necessarily, because, of course, I did not know Mr. Norman at that period. I have no knowledge of his experience at Columbia University, or of any of his university career.

I met him first in 1940 in Japan. So that I do not think, necessarily, that would have come up.

Senator WATKINS. Had you heard of this testimony of Professor Wittfogel that had named Mr. Norman as a Communist—member of a Communist cell?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have heard of testimony with respect to Mr. Norman because, as I say, we obtained from the Canadian Legation, or Canadian Embassy, in 1952, this press release which stated that Norman had been cleared. So I knew there had been some charges. Whether I was aware specifically of Dr. Wittfogel's charges, I cannot remember that I have heard about them since—I think, probably, that I had heard that that was the testimony. I am not sure when he made those statements.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, how much of this conversation was devoted to this discussion of his having been cleared and your having been cleared?

Mr. EMMERSON. A very small part of it. It was mentioned—
Mr. MORRIS. Five or ten minutes?

Mr. EMMERSON. Five or ten minutes.

Senator WATKINS. Were your wives present during all this time?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; during all of the conversation there was no separation.

Mr. MORRIS. But there was no discussion of the specifics in either case, in your case or his case?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. MORRIS. What, specifically, was the evidence that appeared in the record, or—

Mr. EMMERSON. No; there was no discussion of the specific evidence.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, you said this was primarily a social visit?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. Yet you did discuss the situation generally; did you not?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; certainly.

Mr. MORRIS. I think you have so testified.

Mr. EMMERSON. Which would be a normal thing to do.

Mr. MORRIS. I wonder if you could recapture again as much of the detail at that time about this conversation—how much of the 2 hours was devoted to a discussion of the situation that existed at that time—

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I could not specify exactly the time.

They came up to our apartment, and they came in and sat down. We had a cocktail, we showed them around the apartment—we have a view of the Mediterranean from our terrace—we talked about where we had been in the meantime, what our assignments had been.

As I recall, for about maybe 5 minutes or more we did discuss this matter of clearances, and then we got into the Middle East situation.

This, as I testified the other day, was, of course, before the Israeli attack or before the French and British attack, so none of those matters came into it. We were concerned with the general developments in the Middle East.

I had been to Israel a few weeks before, and I am sure that I must have talked about my experiences in Israel, my observations down there of the situation, and I had had several interviews there.

And I am sure that he spoke about the situation in Egypt. I believe he referred to the economic situation there, and about the Suez Canal problem which, of course, was concerning everyone.

But as I testified previously, I have tried to go over this to the very best of my memory, and I cannot recall any categorical statements, any statements, that would be considered slanted in the pro-Communist sense, which he made.

Mr. MORRIS. You did discuss your official business over there, and things you had been doing?

Mr. EMMERSON. We discussed the general situation in the area, which Foreign Service officers always do when they get together.

Senator WATKINS. Did you discuss the part that apparently Russia was attempting to play in the Mideast?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure we did, because that is the one thing in Beirut which concerned us most; the penetration of the Communists. And he asked a great many questions of me about Lebanon, because he was coming there for the first time; I am sure I talked about the Communist efforts, which had been quite considerable even in the small country of Lebanon—that is, to try to infiltrate by cultural means and commercial means, to get an influence in the country by indirect methods.

Mr. MORRIS. And you answered all those questions fully—you did not have any reservations in your answer?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I answered them. I certainly did not divulge any classified information, but I answered them to the best of my ability.

Mr. MORRIS. I mean, the point is, you had no reservations in answering questions; he was an old friend whom you trusted, and you responded completely to his questions?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had only the normal relations, which any Foreign Service officer has, if he is discussing something with a person outside his own Government and his own Department of State.

Senator WATKINS. Well, you would not discuss it as confidentially with him as you would have done with the Ambassador?

Mr. EMMERSON. With my own?

Senator WATKINS. Your own Ambassador.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, certainly not. There is, of course, a great difference.

Senator WATKINS. I have talked with quite a number of ambassadors, and I did on that trip I had over there in 1953, but I never knew how much they were keeping back from me. I didn't know whether they ever told me all they knew about these things or not, and whether they would discuss with me classified matters.

Mr. MORRIS. You mentioned Joseph Fromm. Had you known him in the Far East?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot remember whether I met him. He was stationed in the Far East at the same time I was, but I had met him on previous occasions, and he came to call on me specifically at the Embassy.

Senator WATKINS. All the times that you knew him, was he representative of the U. S. News & World Report? Is that the one?

Mr. EMMERSON. He is now. Wasn't he with Newsweek before? I am sorry, I cannot remember. But I do not know him well at all; I have only seen him two or three times.

Mr. MORRIS. I have only one more question.

How much of that time, of the 2 hours, did you discuss the political situation in the Middle East?

Mr. EMMERSON. I should say it might have been 20 minutes or 30 minutes, because we then went into lunch and sat around the table, and I am sure at the lunch table we did not carry on this discussion.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I think Mr. Sourwine has some questions.

Senator WATKINS. Mr. Sourwine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Emmerson, you have told us, I assume now, all of the changes that you desire to make in this transcript after reading it?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I believe—

Mr. SOURWINE. I just want to be sure you have the opportunity fully and had not been sidetracked by other questions.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is only one other minor detail.

Senator Watkins, on page 2051, says, "You would have been about 28 when you were in China," and I replied, "That is right."

Well, I was 28 in 1936, when I entered the Service, when I first went to the Far East. But in 1944, that is the period that you are referring to, I was, of course, 36.

Mr. SOURWINE. You had been in the Far East 8 years then, as a Foreign Service officer?

Senator WATKINS. I probably miscalculated; I just did it in a hurry.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not recount correctly.

Mr. SOURWINE. I think this illustrates, Senator, that Mr. Emmerson has gone through this transcript very carefully to make any notes.

Senator WATKINS. I think that would be a considerable discrepancy. I asked him if he was 28, and he said, yes he was 28.

Mr. SOURWINE. He might have misunderstood your question at the time, and then, in reading it, noted it.

Does that include everything that you wanted to volunteer with respect to changes or emendations of what you testified?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, I believe it does.

Mr. SOURWINE. There is a point in that record where you testified with respect to the military mission which was sent to Yenan. Do you remember talking about that? You said, I believe, that this was with Chiang Kai-shek's approval. How do you know that, or how was that evident to your knowledge?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I was in Chungking before going up to Yenan, and I was aware that, as is common knowledge in headquarters, that when Vice President Wallace made his trip to China, he specifically requested Chiang Kai-shek to permit the United States to send an observer mission to Communist China, and that is my recollection—that consent was given at that time by the generalissimo, and the mission was later established.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know, Mr. Emmerson, that the generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, sent for the American Ambassador to protest this mission in Yenan?

Mr. EMMERSON. After it was established?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Going back to the question of the occasion of Mr. Norman's visit to Beirut, when you saw him on October—I think you said the 27th—

Mr. EMMERSON. The 27th.

Mr. SOURWINE (continuing). Do you know what time of the morning the boat docked?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it must have been early in the morning, probably 8 o'clock, although I am not sure.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, you had, on the day before, telephoned the attaché and had talked to him, and through him had extended an oral invitation to Mr. Norman to visit?

Mr. EMMERSON. A written note.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was.

And you had also talked to him on the—

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I had talked to him previously on social occasions. When I learned they were coming on the 27th—

Mr. SOURWINE. Oh, yes.

So you had supplemented that earlier oral invitation with a written note on the 26th?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. And then you had been on the telephone on the morning of the 27th and confirmed the arrangements that they were going to visit you?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot remember how the word came to me. I assume it was by telephone during the morning.

Mr. SOURWINE. These are matters which had escaped your recollection when you testified earlier?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right. I was concentrating on the substance of the conversation, and I simply did not recall these arrangements.

Mr. SOURWINE. The specific question, I think, was who had gotten in touch with whom first.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. And these matters escaping your recollection, you just assumed that it had been he who had gotten in touch with you?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was the assumption from reading the testimony afterward, and that is why I wanted at once to clarify the record.

Mr. SOURWINE. It must have been your assumption at the time, because that is the way you testified?

Mr. EMMERSON. I forgot—

Mr. SOURWINE. You were testifying according to the best of your recollection?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right, and I completely forgot this exchange of correspondence.

Mr. SOURWINE. And when you were asked how he got in touch with you, you assumed it must have been through mutual friends, and you had forgotten the matter of your previous contact with the—

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you recall, in your conversation with Mr. Norman, who brought up the matter of clearance? Did he bring it up, or did you ask him about it?

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to me that he brought it up first. That is best of my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did he bring it up by asking you about your own situation, or by way of volunteering with respect to his own status?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not remember how the conversation was introduced. I believe he probably referred to this affidavit. I had never had any personal contact with him at that time, and the Canadian Embassy had contacted him at Ottawa and furnished him with this affidavit. And I believe that he mentioned that first, and then went on to speak about his own clearance. That is the best of my recollection.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

What affidavit do you mean, Mr. Emmerson? I do not have clearly in mind the affidavit you speak of. Was it an affidavit given by Mr. Norman?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right. When the charges were made with respect to this interrogation of Japanese prisoners of war, in order to complete the documentation, which we tried to get together for my hearings in 1952, in addition to getting affidavits from the officers of SCAP, who had personal knowledge of this, we asked for an affidavit from Mr. Norman, since he participated, and he supplied that through the Canadian Embassy.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was, then, an affidavit which, through official channels, was supplied to the United States State Department?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is how you came to know about it?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is how I came to know about it.

Mr. SOURWINE. It was not an affidavit he gave to the Canadians, to defend himself there?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, no; not at all.

Mr. SOURWINE. Going back, sir, to the question of the military mission, and Chiang Kai-shek's interest therein, were you aware of this report—with the chairman's permission—I should have handed it to the chairman first, but it just came to me. May I read it into the record?

Senator WATKINS. What does it purport to be?

Mr. SOURWINE. It is the text of one of the documents which was found in the Amerasia papers. It was a State Department report, so far as the indications are, which had been given to Mr. Jaffe from some source, and was one of the papers that was seized.

Senator WATKINS. Before reading the whole thing to him, can you determine whether or not he knows anything about the general subject matter?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes; I have already done that, sir, in asking him whether he knew of Chiang's protest to the Ambassador about the military mission in Yenan.

This is what purports to be a copy of a State Department report about that matter, and I wanted to attempt to refresh the witness' recollection by asking him if he saw this State Department report.

Senator WATKINS. You may do so.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I read it, sir?

Senator WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE (reading):

Chinese Communist problem.—On August 30, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek sent for the American Ambassador and for an hour and a half discussed the Communist problem. He said that the American Government does not understand the problem and that it was the duty of the Ambassador to explain it effectively.

Besides charging the Communists as usual with treachery and bad faith, the main points of Chiang's argument which he stressed and repeated constantly are: On world problems China is disposed to follow the United States. Suggestions by us that the Chinese Government should improve its relations with the Soviet Union are not an unfriendly act on our part. With regard to the domestic problem of Chinese Communists, our Government should fully sympathize with and support China. The attitude which we assume may result very seriously for China. In urging the Chinese Government to resolve its differences with the Communists, we are only strengthening the Communists in their recalcitrant attitude. When we ask that China agree to the demands of the Communists, it is the same as asking China to surrender unconditionally to a group which is known to be under the influence of a foreign government (the Soviet Union). We should tell the Communists to come to an agreement with and submit to the Chungking government. The Communists are growing arrogant and refuse to go on with negotiations since our observer group arrived in Yenan. (This message from Chungking is incomplete, only one section having been received.)

I show it to you as purporting to be a copy, not an original, and simply for the purpose of refreshing your recollection as to whether you have ever seen or heard about that report.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is this supposed to be a message from the Embassy in Chungking?

Mr. SOURWINE. It is supposed to be a message to the State Department. I would presume it is from the Embassy. I do not know whether it is from the Embassy.

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I have not seen this document before. At least, I have no recollection of having seen it.

Mr. SOURWINE. Which bears out what you said earlier, that you had no knowledge of any such protest?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not go up to Yenan until October, and the mission had been in place for some time.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that is what you were talking about earlier—the consent which, you say, was extended to Mr. Wallace when he was there?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was in July.

Mr. SOURWINE. And that was all you knew about any question about the establishment of the mission?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. I knew the mission was established, and I proceeded there under official orders.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir.

Do you know, Mr. Emerson, do you recall whether, in your discussion with Mr. Norman, there was any discussion of the imminence or probability of British action, or joint British-French action?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I am sure there was no discussion on that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you make any report to the Department of your conference with Mr. Norman?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not make any report. I considered this was a social occasion of the type which we have constantly, and since there was no significance in the conversation I did not make a report.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Emerson, back in the time when you and Mr. Norman were both attached to SCAP in one way or another, were you engaged in counterespionage work?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was not; no.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were not.

You had mentioned counterespionage, and I wondered if you had counterespionage duties.

Mr. EMMERSON. I had no duties with that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was Mr. Norman in counterespionage work?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think so. He was in the section of the Counter Intelligence Corps which I believe was called Research and Analysis. It indicates it was the research side of the CIC operation.

Mr. SOURWINE. But he was under CIO?

Mr. EMMERSON. He was under CIC.

Mr. SOURWINE. And you were not?

Mr. EMMERSON. And I was not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did your official duties require you to confer with one another?

Mr. EMMERSON. They did, on several occasions when we would be working on a paper which was affected by the reports that we were making, and vice versa.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

That is, you were sometimes ordered or requested or required, in line of duty, to confer with him?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. And presumably, he with you?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were your offices, that is, your office and his office, physically close in SCAP headquarters?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. Our offices were in the Mitsui Building, which was in one part of Tokyo and, as I recall, his was in the Dai Ichi Building, or in a building near the Dai Ichi Building, which was some distance from ours.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

That is a matter measurable in miles, isn't it?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; I would say maybe 2 miles.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you did confer, did you go to his office or did he come to your office, or did you confer at some middle—

Mr. EMMERSON. I would go to his office, and sometimes he would come to mine.

Mr. SOURWINE. Both?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you drove into Tokyo with prisoners of war, were you and Mr. Norman both in the same automobile?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not believe so. I think he was in one and I was in another.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who was with you—Shiga or Tokuda, or both?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, I really cannot remember. There were, I think, two cars—

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON (continuing). And I cannot remember whether Shiga was in my car or the other car.

Mr. SOURWINE. Was Tokuda with you or in the other car?

Mr. EMMERSON. To the best of my memory now, it seems to me I have the impression that Tokuda was in the car where I was. But that is, again, simply an impression; I have not thought about this since the time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, I thought you might remember inasmuch as you probably had some conversation on the way, and you might know with whom you talked.

Mr. EMMERSON. I recall that coming into Tokyo that Shiga, I believe, got carsick and we had to stop the cars and get out for a few minutes.

Mr. SOURWINE. The two cars were in a convoy, so that when the car Shiga was in stopped, you had to stop, too?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, after the interrogation, what happened to these two men, Shiga and Tokuda, if you know?

Mr. EMMERSON. After the interrogation we delivered them, the cars delivered them, back to headquarters. On October the 10th they were released from prison.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, what was the day of the interrogation?

Mr. EMMERSON. To the best of my knowledge, it was about October 6, October 6 or 7.

Mr. SOURWINE. So that on this occasion, in spite of the fact that SCAP had issued orders freeing all political prisoners, when you finished the interrogation you took them back to the prison?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; because the date of their actual liberation was October 10.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Did you drive with them when they went back to prison?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not believe I did. I have no recollection of that.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know whether Mr. Norman did?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I do not remember.

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, you do not know, then, what route was followed in taking them back to the prison, or how directly they went, or whether they might have driven around Tokyo at that time?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; I do not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Were any instructions given in that regard, as far as you know?

Mr. EMMERSON. Instructions were to take them back to the prison.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who gave those instructions?

Mr. EMMERSON. Counter Intelligence people. I cannot remember the individual—

Mr. SOURWINE. And Mr. Norman did not?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; they were entirely under the direction of the Counter Intelligence Corps.

Senator WATKINS. They were still in their custody, were they not?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Senator WATKINS. Even when they were up there for investigation?

Mr. EMMERSON. They had not yet been released from prison.

Mr. SOURWINE. The route they took was not under Mr. Norman's control or under Mr. Emmerson's control?

Senator WATKINS. I assume that would be true, if they were in the custody of the Army people—whoever had them.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is right. They do not even know what route they took, or whether or not they drove around Tokyo after the interrogation. Is that right?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. It is your testimony that you did not know?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you came in from the prison to headquarters, what route did you follow, sir; do you remember?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not remember. Fujii is a suburb of Tokyo, it is out quite a little distance. I cannot remember how many miles, but

it is some little distance from Tokyo. It must have taken 45 minutes or an hour to drive in.

Mr. SOURWINE. As far as you know, was it a direct route which you followed?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was the direct route; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. When you came in?

Mr. EMMERSON. When we came in.

Mr. SOURWINE. And as you say, you do not know what route was followed when they were taken back?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Morris, I do not know whether it is desirable this morning—I know the chairman said he did not have too much time—

Senator WATKINS. I had an Interior meeting at 10 o'clock, and when I came up here I intended to stay a few minutes and go down there, but since you did not have anyone here to preside, I stayed on. There is a very important project up for one of my sister States.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, as you know, the purpose of this session today was to give Mr. Emmerson a chance to correct the record.

Now, we have some more reports and things we would like to ask him about, but we were not prepared to do that today, sir.

Senator WATKINS. Well, if you are not prepared to do it today, then let's recess.

Mr. MORRIS. And you are satisfied now, Mr. Emmerson, that the corrections have been made, the changes have been made in your answers, as set forth in connection with this testimony which appears at pages 2044, 2045, and 2047 of the official transcript?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Senator WATKINS. It would be fair also to say that in addition to the changes, there was some amplification. In other words, he went into it more fully.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was my intention; to amplify the testimony.

Senator WATKINS. The committee will be in recess.

(Whereupon, at 11:05 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the name of an individual or an organization in this index.

	A	Page
Adler, Solomon		3664
Amerasia papers		3681
American Embassy (Beirut)		3645
American Embassy (Chungking)		3646, 3648
American Embassy (Moscow)		3659
American Embassy (Paris)		3646
American Embassy (Tokyo)		3657
American Friends of the Chinese People		3659
Arab world, the		3673
Army (United States)		3646
Athens, Greece		3666
Australia/n		3649, 3650
 B 		
Beirut, Lebanon	3645, 3646, 3661–3663, 3666–3669, 3673, 3676, 3678, 3680	
British	3652, 3662, 3677, 3682	
Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs		3654, 3666
Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs		3646
Burma		3651
 C 		
Cairo	3657, 3661, 3662, 3664, 3668, 3673	
Canada	3657, 3660, 3663, 3664, 3668, 3674	
Canadian		3660, 3664, 3670
Canadian Ambassador		3656, 3657
Canadian Embassy		3677, 3681
Canadian Foreign Office:		
American desk		3657
Far Eastern desk		3657
Canadian Foreign Service		3657
Canadian Friends of the Chinese People		3659
Canadian Government	3656, 3657, 3660, 3663, 3669, 3675	
Canadian Legation		3677
Canadian Legation (Beirut)		3668
Canadian Legation (Tokyo)		3657
Canadian Minister		3661
Cannon, Cavendish		3666
Cartwright, Mr.		3645
Chi, Dr.		3658
Chiang Kai-shek	3646, 3679, 3681, 3682	
China	3646–3649, 3651–3654, 3659, 3665, 3679, 3682	
China, Communist	3653, 3655, 3659, 3665, 3679	
Chinese		3648, 3659
Chinese Communist/s		3646–3648, 3681, 3682
Chinese Nationalist Government		3659
Chungking	3646, 3648, 3651, 3653, 3659, 3664, 3679, 3682	
Clark, Laura Irene		3660
Columbia University		3656, 3657, 3659, 3674, 3676
Communist/s	3648–3654, 3656–3663, 3665, 3670, 3672–3678, 3682	
Communist headquarters (Yenan)		3646
Communist Party	3649, 3660, 3661, 3665, 3673–3675	
Counter Intelligence Corps	3655, 3661, 3669, 3683, 3684	

D

	Page
Dai Ichi Building	3683
Davis, Lieutenant Colonel	3671
Deputy Under Secretary of State for Canada	3664
Dooman, Eugene	3654, 3655, 3656, 3664, 3670, 3671
Dulles, Secretary	3665

E

Eden, Prime Minister	3662
Egypt	3656, 3657, 3664, 3666, 3678
Eighth Route Army	3652
Emmerson, John K.:	
Testimony of	3645-3666, 3667-3685
Deputy chief of mission, counselor of embassy, Beirut, Lebanon	3645
On special assignment to General Assembly of U. N.	3645
Liaison officer to U. N. for Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, State Department	3646

F

Far East	3653, 3658, 3663, 3664, 3674, 3678, 3679
Far East Subcommittee of the State Department	3653
FBI	3675
Federal Bureau of Investigation	3660
Foreign Service	3646, 3668, 3678, 3679
France	3658
French	3662, 3671, 3677, 3682
Fromm, Joseph	3673, 3678
Fujii (suburb of Tokyo)	3684

G

Germany	3651, 3653
Gouzenko	3660

H

Haga	3654, 3655
Halperin, Israel	3660
Harvard University	3660
Hildreth, Ambassador	3665
Hipsley, Mr.	3645
Hiss, Alger	3660
Holmes, Charles P. H	3660
Holmes, John	3664
House of Commons	3662
Hurley, Patrick J.	3654, 3659

I

Imperial Hotel (Japan)	3658
India	3649, 3650, 3651
Isaacs, Harold	3671
Israel	3662, 3677
Italy	3651

J

Jaffe, Mr.	3681
Japan	3646-3655, 3657, 3658, 3660, 3661, 3663, 3664, 3669-3671, 3673, 3676
Japanese	3646-3657, 3660, 3661, 3669, 3670, 3672, 3681
Japanese Army	3649, 3652
Japanese Communist/s	3646-3650, 3652, 3655, 3656, 3670, 3671
Japanese Communist Party	3661
Japanese Peoples' Emancipation League (Nihon Jinmin Kaiho Renmei)	3647-3652
Japanese Socialist Party	3672
Jenner, Senator William E.	3645

INDEX

III

K

Page

Karachi	3665, 3666
Kim	3672
Korea/n	3651, 3655, 3672
Korean Communist	3672

L

Lattimore, Owen	3658, 3659
Lebanon	3657, 3661, 3666, 3678
London	3662
Luzon	3651

M

MacArthur, General	3655, 3656, 3669-3671
Manchuria	3651
Mandel, Benjamin	3645, 3667
Marxist	3660
McLean, Donald	3656
McManus, Robert	3645, 3667
Mediterranean	3677
Middle East	3646, 3661, 3662, 3664, 3666, 3673, 3677-3679
Military Aid Agreement	3665
Mitsui Building (Tokyo)	3683
Morris, Brewster	3668
Morris, Robert	3645, 3667
Moscow	3659, 3664, 3665
Murphy, Ray	3665

N

Nasser regime	3664
Navy, Secretary of	3653
Near East	3664, 3666, 3673
Newsweek	3678
New York	3654, 3655, 3664
New Zealand	3656, 3657, 3664, 3668
Nihon Jinmin Kaiho Renmei. (<i>See</i> Japanese Peoples' Emancipation League.)	3661
NKVD	3661
Norman, E. Herbert	3655-3661, 3663, 3664, 3667-3677, 3680-3684
North China	3655
Northern Tier	3665
Nozaka (<i>see also</i> Okano)	3646-3648

O

Okano, Susumu (also known as Nozaka)	3646-3648, 3652, 3654, 3655
OSS	3651, 3654, 3655
Ottawa	3660, 3681

P

Pakistan	3665
Paris	3646
Peoples Peasants and Workers School	3647
Policy Planning Board	3666
"Proposed Projects Against Japan"	3648
Provost Marshal General	3652

R

Research and Analysis (CIC)	3683
Roy, Lionel	3668
Rusher, William A	3645, 3667
Russia/n	3650, 3651, 3658, 3660, 3676, 3678

S

	Page
Saipan	3651
SCAP	3656, 3660, 3669, 3671, 3681-3684
SEATO Pact	3666
Shantung Province	3651
Shiga, Mr.	3655, 3670, 3671, 3683, 3684
Shuji, Fujii	3654, 3664
Siberia	3661
Sinai Desert	3662
Smith, Gen. Bedell	3659
Sourwine, J. G	3667
Soviet Union	3651, 3665, 3666, 3682
Stalin	3651
State Department	3645, 3646, 3651-3654, 3659, 3660, 3665, 3666, 3671, 3673, 3675, 3678, 3681, 3682
State Department Loyalty Security Board	3655
State, Secretary of	3653
State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWING)	3650, 3653
Stilwell, General	3646, 3651, 3653
Suez	3662, 3678
SWING (State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee)	3650, 3653

T

Tamotsu	3655
Texas	3652
Thorpe, General	3670
Tokuda, Mr.	3655, 3670, 3683, 3684
Tokyo	3655-3657, 3660, 3661, 3672, 3683-3685
Treasury Department	3664
Tsuru, Shigeto	3660, 3664

U

United Nations	3646, 3664, 3666, 3668
United Nations General Assembly	3645, 3646, 3664
United Nations, United States delegation to	3646
United States Intelligence	3660
United States Observers' Mission	3646
U. S. News & World Report	3673, 3678

W

Wallace, Vice President	3679, 3682
War Department	3650, 3652
War, Secretary of	3653
Warren, Ambassador	3665
Washington	3650, 3652, 3654, 3655, 3659
Watkins, Senator Arthur V.	3645, 3667
Wedemeyer, General	3651, 3652, 3654
Wellington, New Zealand	3668
Wittfogel, Professor	3659, 3674-3677

Y

Yenan	3646-3648, 3650, 3651, 3653, 3655, 3659, 3679, 3681, 3682
-------	---

X

Scal

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY
ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS
OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE
UNITED STATES

MARCH 26, 27, AND APRIL 4, 1957

PART 57

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1957

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

NOV 18 1957

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee
OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., Missouri
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming
MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi, *Chairman*

OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina
JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas
SAM J. ERVIN, JR., North Carolina
MATTHEW M. NEELY, West Virginia

WILLIAM E. JENNER, Indiana
ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland
ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Nebraska

ROBERT MORRIS, *Chief Counsel*

J. G. SOURWINE, *Associate Counsel*

WILLIAM A. RUSHER, *Associate Counsel*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Witness :	
Niebyl, Karl H-----	3760
Tsuru, Shigeto-----	3687

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1957

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11:15 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator Olin D. Johnston, presiding.

Present: Senators Johnston and Jenner.

Also present; Robert Morris, chief counsel; J. G. Sourwine, associate counsel; William A. Rusher, associate counsel; and Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Senator JOHNSTON. The committee will come to order. Attorney Morris will take charge.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it best that Mr. Tsuru be sworn again.

Senator JOHNSTON. Do you swear that the evidence you give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TSURU. Yes, I do.

TESTIMONY OF SHIGETO TSURU, CAMBRIDGE, MASS., ACCCOMPANIED BY CHARLES GLOVER, HIS ATTORNEY

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Tsuru, will you give your name and address to the stenotype reporter?

Mr. TSURU. My name is Shigeto Tsuru—S-h-i-g-e-t-o T-s-u-r-u. At present my address is 18-A Forest Street, Cambridge 40, Mass.

Mr. MORRIS. What is your business at this time, business or profession?

Mr. TSURU. My profession is professor of economics at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo. I am on the permanent staff of this university. Currently I am at Harvard University as a visiting lecturer, invited by the American-Japan Intellectual Interchange Committee for the term of 1 year.

Mr. MORRIS. And what do you do, do you teach at Harvard?

Mr. TSURU. Under the terms of this invitation, my main job at Harvard is research. But I assist occasionally in a number of courses, to give sort of guest lectures.

Mr. MORRIS. Now you also, I think, as you told me in that letter, you are also doing broadcasting on the Voice of America?

Mr. TSURU. I have made an appointment with Voice of America to broadcast on April 18 on my impressions of the United States after visiting this country after 15 years.

Mr. MORRIS. Now what other cultural exchange are you engaged in at this time?

Mr. TSURU. Aside from doing research at Harvard University and giving lectures there, I participate occasionally in academic conferences, such as the forthcoming conference of Asian studies to be held in Boston in the first week of April, where I shall present a paper on the problem of employment in Japan.

I have also agreed to participate in the student conference of Columbia University student council, also in the first week of April. When I am invited by university communities to give lectures on my own special subject, so far as my time permits, I accept invitations and give such lectures.

Mr. MORRIS. Now is there anything else, Senators, about the present activities that you would like to know?

Senator JOHNSTON. Any questions?

Senator JENNER. No questions.

Mr. MORRIS. Where were you born, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. I was actually born in Tokyo, Japan. However, technically, I was born in USA—that happens to be the same as USA—Oita prefecture in Japan.

If you would like me to, I shall explain the difference between actual and technical?

Mr. MORRIS. I do not think it is necessary in this case.

Will you tell us briefly what your education was in Japan?

Mr. TSURU. I had the normal experience as a Japanese student, to go through grade school, what we used to call middle school, and higher school. Middle school usually takes 5 years, but I finished it in 4 years, and entered the Eighth Higher School of Nagoya, in 1929. However, I did not finish the Eighth Higher School. I left Japan in 1931 and came to this country for study.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. What year were you born, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. I am sorry, 1912.

Mr. MORRIS. And you came to the United States for the first time when?

Mr. TSURU. September 1931.

Mr. MORRIS. And how long did you stay at that particular time?

Mr. TSURU. I entered Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., as a freshman, stayed there for 2 years, and transferred myself to Harvard College in the fall of 1933 as a provisional junior and returned to Japan for a temporary stay in the summer of 1934. I came back to the United States again in September 1934. Would you like me to continue?

Mr. MORRIS. I think that is satisfactory at this point.

In other words, you would make intermittent trips back to Japan?

Mr. TSURU. I did make a number of trips back to Japan, for each one of which I had a special purpose.

Mr. MORRIS. Now what university did you attend in the United States?

Mr. TSURU. As I mentioned, I was at Lawrence College, Appleton, as a freshman and sophomore, and then Harvard University where I got my bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctor of philosophy.

Mr. GLOVER. Could he amplify an earlier answer?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. I mentioned about my returning to Japan intermittently, and each time I had a special purpose. I did not amplify it, but I should like to say the occasions and purposes of my return were such as my mother's death, marriage—

Mr. MORRIS. Who did you marry, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. Miss Masako Wada.

Mr. MORRIS. She is the niece, is she not, of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal?

Mr. TSURU. The former Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, Koichi, K-o-i-c-h-i, I believe—K-i-d-o.

Mr. MORRIS. Now when were you at Harvard University?

Mr. TSURU. I was at Harvard University from September 1933 to June 1942.

Mr. MORRIS. And what did you do during that period?

Mr. TSURU. At first I was a college student, junior and senior, and then became a graduate student in economics. I received my masters' degree in 1936, and then I had some research assistant's jobs, odds and ends, and in a subsequent period worked for my doctor of philosophy, which I got in 1940. However, I remained at Harvard University until June 1942.

Mr. MORRIS. And then in June 1942 what did you do?

Mr. TSURU. Previously Mrs. Tsuru and I had applied for repatriation. However, we were told, I believe by the State Department, that since we were living unmolested in the United States, we shall be on the low priority list so far as repatriation is concerned. Thus we were reconciled to the idea of staying on in this country for further years, but suddenly, I believe it was June 2, if I remember correctly, we received a telegram from the State Department that we shall be repatriates by the first boat for repatriation, *Gripsholm*, and we were to report ourselves at Ellis Island, I believe, by June 7.

So we did so, and we were repatriated by the *Gripsholm*.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman and Senator Jenner, the purpose of this hearing today is to ask Mr. Tsuru to identify for the public record, which he has already done in executive session, portions of his papers and books which he left behind at the time of his repatriation in 1942, about which he has just told us.

I would like to offer for the record the following documents:

A letter dated August 31, 1936, signed by Tsuru—who gave as his address: "At present: Madison but please answer care of the International House, 1414 E. 59th Street, Chicago, Illinois" with the salutation: "Dear Bill" and, in parentheses, "W. T. Parry."

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Morris, as each one of these comes up, we would like to check it over.

Mr. MORRIS. Maybe, while I am putting these in the public record now, we will get back to them together.

Mr. GLOVER. We may want to object to some of them going into the record.

Mr. MORRIS. You have acknowledged they are his documents.

Senator JENNER. He acknowledged they are his documents. He examined them and said he recalls them.

Mr. TSURU. Excuse me. I said in executive session, when this group of records was presented to me for the first time, I skimmed through very quickly, and I felt they either belonged to me, or were written by me.

Mr. GLOVER. But I think, now they are going into the record, that we should have a change to—

Mr. TSURU. I should like to make certain.

Mr. MORRIS. Why don't you read it aloud, this first one we are talking about, Mr. Tsuru? Will you do that for us?

Senator JOHNSTON. Read it, then.

Mr. MORRIS. And then you can tell us if it is not yours.

Mr. GLOVER. Now, we have had a chance to look at this one.

Mr. TSURU. The first one, I think, was written by me.

Senator JOHNSTON. You think? You know your own handwriting, don't you?

Mr. MORRIS. It is typed.

I wonder if you would read it aloud? Senator Johnston, unlike Senator Jenner, has not read this one. Would you read it aloud for us?

Mr. TSURU. You know, I have been speaking from this morning—I may get tired. If you order me to, I shall be willing to read it. But for one thing, my pronunciation may not be quite correct. Since I have already admitted it is mine, could not one of your—

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, in order to relieve Mr. Tsuru, maybe Mr. Mandel, our research director, could read the first letter for us.

Senator JOHNSTON. Mr. Mandel, will you read the letter?

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

At present: Madison

But please answer care of The International House, 1414 E. 59th Street,
Chicago, Ill.

August 31, 1936.

DEAR BILL—

Mr. MORRIS. You knew Mr. Parry at this time?

Mr. TSURU. Yes; I did know Mr. Parry then.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was Mr. Parry at that time?

Mr. TSURU. I believe Mr. Parry was an instructor of philosophy at Harvard University.

Mr. MORRIS. And you knew him at the time?

Mr. TSURU. Yes; I did know him at the time.

Mr. MORRIS. And what was the nature of your association with him?

Mr. TSURU. I cannot be exact because I do not remember exactly, but most likely from around 1934 to around 1940 or so.

Senator JOHNSTON. That is after you finished your bachelor of arts degree?

Mr. TSURU. I finished my bachelor of arts degree in 1935.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know him well?

Mr. TSURU. I knew him well enough to call him by the first name.

Mr. MORRIS. But your association was not what you would call an intimate association?

Mr. TSURU. I would not call it a very intimate association.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, for the record, I would like to identify Mr. Parry.

Mr. Parry is Mr. William T. Parry, who was identified before the House Un-American Activities Committee by Richard G. Davis, a college professor who had been a Communist in the past and testified as to the makeup of certain Communist cells in the area of Boston.

One of the persons he identified as a Communist on the Harvard faculty was William T. Parry.

When Mr. Parry was called before the House Un-American Activities Committee, he refused to answer, claiming privilege under the fifth amendment, as to whether or not he had been a member of the Communist Party.

The date of that testimony, Senator, was May 19, 1953.

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Mr. MANDEL (reading) :

Thus far I have not reported to you anything concerning the matter of the Association of Marxian Studies, mainly because the entire matter in this district has been only in the formative stage both with respect to its theory and practice. It still is. For a definite reason, however, I feel it necessary to report immediately the major problems which have arisen here in connection with the matter of organizing the association.

First, I shall try to formulate my understanding of the nature of the educational activities centered around the magazine. The publication of the magazine itself, without the association or study groups around it, has its educational significance.

Mr. MORRIS. Excuse me, Mr. Mandel.

What magazine are you talking about there, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. I believe science and society.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. What was your connection with Science and Society?

Mr. TSURU. I think it was also around 1936, this Mr. Parry approached me, asking me if I would not cooperate in the publication of this magazine, Science and Society, since they did not have sufficiently good men in the field of economics, and I was known to him, I believe, as a student of economics who knew Karl Marx—I do not mean I knew Karl Marx myself, but Marx's writings.

And he approached me if I would not cooperate, so I told him "I shall be willing to do so, if it is not to be as a member of the editorial board or such things, but simply to give advices on articles which appear, or the kind of things which might be proposed for publication, that is, the kind of subjects which might be dealt with in this type of magazine."

I agreed to do so.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you ever write for the magazine?

Mr. TSURU. Not that I recall, but I may have written one book review.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Did you use your own name or did you use another name?

Mr. TSURU. I used the name of Alfred Z. Lowe.

Mr. MORRIS. What is the meaning of Alfred Z. Lowe, what is the significance of that name?

Mr. TSURU. Well, if you write AZL in capital letters, those of the members of the committee who know the Japanese characters would be able to tell those three letters in capital letters look very much like Japanese characters Bon, in phonetics, TO, and the Japanese character Jin.

Bon-To-Jin used to be my pen name from my early school days.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you tell us what that is for the record—spell that for the record?

Mr. TSURU. Bon-To-Jin, B-o-n—T-o—J-i-n, a pen name which I started using in my high-school days in Japan, and which I still continue to use when I write in Japan for light materials. And Bon means common or ordinary, To means urbane or urban, and Jin means man. To happens to be the first character of my name and Jin happens to be the last character of my name in Japanese.

Mr. MORRIS. Now Mr. Lowe was not your Communist Party alias, was it?

Mr. TSURU. Oh, no. I am sorry, I have never been a member of the Communist Party, nor am I.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Mr. Tsuru, had you not been a member of the Young Communist League in Japan prior to your coming to the United States?

Mr. TSURU. No; I was never a member of the Young Communist League in Japan. I think Japanese authorities will verify that for me if necessary.

Mr. MORRIS. Well did you organize the Anti-Imperialism League?

Mr. TSURU. I was a member of the Anti-Imperialism League when I was in—

Mr. MORRIS. What is the Anti-Imperialism League? That was a form of the Communist organization in Japan, was it not?

Mr. TSURU. Well, one is free to interpret that if you like. I personally do not think so; 1929 and 1930, when I was a member of this Anti-Imperialism League in Japan, was the period when Japan was about to start the invasion of Manchuria. And we younger students wanted to oppose that invasion, and we voluntarily organized what we called the Anti-Imperialism League. When I say "we", actually I was not the first one to do so, but I came in right after it was organized in my school. The main purpose was to oppose the Government policy as regards China.

Mr. MORRIS. Well now, you were arrested in connection with this activity, were you not?

Mr. TSURU. I was arrested in December 1930 in connection with this activity but released without indictment after about 2 months and a half.

Mr. MORRIS. Now were you also associated with the International Communist Relief Corps, which is a part of the overall MOPR—Soviet Relief Organization?

Mr. TSURU. I do not believe I was.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you have any dealings with that organization at all?

Mr. TSURU. I do not think I ever did.

Mr. MORRIS. How about the Senki? Senki, which translated means warfly, which is a national organization of the Japanese Communist Party. Were you ever associated with that in any way?

Mr. TSURU. Senki?

Mr. MORRIS. Senki.

Mr. TSURU. Oh, Senki. It is pronounced Senki. I was never associated with that magazine, although I read some numbers of that magazine.

Mr. MORRIS. But you did not write for it?

Mr. TSURU. I never wrote one, wrote any, article or review or anything for that magazine.

Mr. MORRIS. All right. Now in connection with your activity at Harvard, did you join the Communist Party while you were at Harvard?

Mr. TSURU. I never joined the Communist Party anywhere in the world.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

The reason I asked, Senator, if you come to know these documents, some of these papers are obviously the detailed arrangements that are being made by a group of people to further the work of the Communist Party in the United States. I think, Senator, as we go through these particular documents, that will become apparent.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Morris, I think Mr. Tsuru may want to respond to your characterization of these letters.

Mr. MORRIS. Even before we finish the reading?

Mr. TSURU. You have already characterized the letter in a certain way. So since it is the letter I wrote, if I may, I should like to—

Mr. MORRIS. Why don't we wait until the Senator hears it, and then you may say anything you like about it?

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed with the reading of the letter.

Mr. MANDEL (reading) :

The prospectus is sufficiently clear in this regard. It is as regards the aspect in the use of the magazine as an active propaganda weapon that I should like to develop further. We have already various forms of organization for the educational purposes, for example the Worker's School.

Mr. MORRIS. Now when you say "We have already various forms of organization for the educational purposes, such as the Worker's School," what do you mean by "We have," Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. May I amplify my answer, first, by giving the background of this letter so that I can explain what I meant by "we"?

Besides attending Lawrence College and Harvard University, I also attended, I think on three different occasions, summer sessions of the University of Wisconsin, Madison. I also attended, not regular sessions but occasional lectures, at the University of Chicago, and I came to know a number of people in Madison and Chicago around 1934 to 1937-38, I believe. And at the time, of course, Japan was preparing its China war, I was very critical of the Japanese Government policy as regards China, and I was very eager in my own personal way to bring about a situation which would stop Japan's invasion of China.

I had no organizational relations with any political parties, or political organizations, but I came to know a large number of people who expressed the same opinion as I did as regards Japan's policy on China. Among them I believe there were a number of Communists, although I never attempted to identify them. It was not necessary for me to do so for the intellectual purpose I had in mind.

So among the people I knew in Madison, Chicago, and Cambridge, there were a large number of people who had, let us say in general, leftist tendencies. And in association with them, and in connection with the publication of *Science and Society*, when I traveled, I saw them and discussed the question of the use of the magazine *Science and Society*.

So in a personal, informal letter like this, I might have said "we" without in any way trying to say that "we, some organization."

Senator JENNER. Who were some of these Communists then that you referred to as "we"? Name them.

Mr. TSURU. Well, I want—pardon me, I was not referring to Communists when I said "we."

Senator JENNER. Well, left wingers?

Mr. TSURU. People whom I knew.

Senator JENNER. You called them left wingers, Communists. Who are they? Name them?

Mr. TSURU. I was presented with this letter just this morning, and I shall try my best—

Senator JENNER. You have had the letter, you have studied the letter. Now you are making explanations about what you meant by "we", and we want to know who "we" is.

Mr. TSURU. Actually, I may have written some names in one of the letters, you know—

Senator JENNER. Let's talk about this letter, now.

You were trying to explain what the "we" meant in that letter, let's talk about this letter.

Mr. TSURU. Well, since you asked the names, in order to enable me to recollect best, if I can look through the letters and refresh my memory about the names, I may be able to answer this question better, I think.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean you cannot recall for the Senator now who the people you refer to as Communists a short time ago are?

Senator JENNER. In Wisconsin and in Chicago and at Harvard? You cannot recall a single name?

Mr. TSURU. Pardon me. At Harvard—let me start at Harvard, shall I?

Senator JENNER. Well we were out in Wisconsin and Chicago, I thought.

Mr. TSURU. You see, my association was not very close to the people there, and the names have dropped out of my mind a long time ago. Now, if I can refresh my memory by going through all these letters, then it may come to my mind. That is why I suggested it.

Senator JENNER. You will have a chance.

Go on and read the letter.

Mr. MORRIS. May I ask a question?

You see, Mr. Tsuru, you said this "we" was used in a very loose sense, but I think that very sentence we are talking about here says "We have already various forms of organization" with the word "organization" underlined, "for the educational purposes, such as the Workers School."

Senator JENNER. And the Workers School is the Communist school in Boston?

Mr. MORRIS. And it was right in Communist Party headquarters, was it not?

Senator JENNER. Does that refresh your memory?

Mr. MORRIS. 1919 Washington Street, Boston.

Senator JENNER. Does that refresh your memory as to who "we" was?

Mr. TSURU. I was writing from Madison. I do not know what Workers School I refer to. I may have referred to the Workers School in Boston.

Senator JENNER. You did, the Workers School.

Mr. TSURU. I may have referred to the Workers School in Chicago. I do not know whether a Workers School existed in Chicago.

Senator JENNER. It was also a Communist school in Chicago, wasn't it?

Mr. TSURU. Well, Senator, if I may—

Senator JENNER. You are a well educated man, don't try to banter this committee around, just tell us the truth.

Mr. TSURU. I am not going to avoid any questions. I am trying my best to reconstruct the circumstances which made me write these letters, and trying to explain.

As I said earlier, I was opposed to the Japanese invasion of China, and probably I deliberately sought for people who were opposed to the same and also, and I had a share of youthful adventure, and I am sure I overstepped the limits of propriety in my association.

I do not deny it. However, I was confident in my own mind what I believed in, and I thought I could cope with—probably I was over-confident—I thought I could face anyone and resist any temptation of being led into something. So I was ready to talk with Communists, ready to talk with Fascists, ready to talk with anyone.

So, my association, you might say, was generally free, so I came in contact with these people also. But those whose friendship I cherished best, I do remember—even though a long time ago—their names and so on. A large number of people I came into contact with while I was in this country last time, and in certain moments of stresses, I may have done something which, in my own deep reflection, I should not have done. And I regret it if I find any of these mistakes.

The very fact I have left these letters back in my apartment, without even taking care of them, is, I think, an indication that my records were open for anyone to see.

I was willing to answer the questions—

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Tsuru, you sent someone back to retrieve the letters, didn't you?

Mr. TSURU. No; I did not. Would you like me to explain the circumstances of my—

Senator JENNER. Mr. Chairman, don't you think we ought to get this one letter in the record so we will have some idea of what we are driving at, and then we can take this up?

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes; let's go ahead with the letter.

Mr. MANDEL (reading) :

The existing forms are adapted mainly for the members of the working class and the lower middle class or for the members of the party and YCL—

that means Young Communist League—

Senator JENNER. What party were you referring to there?

Mr. TSURU. I believe this reference is to the Communist Party.

Senator JENNER. For the party. All right, go ahead.

Mr. MANDEL (continuing reading letter) :

for the fairly large group of professionals and the majority of the middle class, however, we either have not developed an effective organization or have tried to develop one without success.

Mr. MORRIS. There, again, you use the word "we," do you not, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. Well, you keep on pressing me on that.

Mr. MORRIS. Here you are talking about "we" you are using the expression "we," Mr. Tsuru, and you are talking about "we" have need of a certain organization.

Senator JENNER. The party, the party has the need for it.

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Chairman, may I respond to this question?

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Mr. TSURU. If you are trying to establish the fact that I was a member of the Communist Party or the YCL, as I am under oath, I can truthfully say I never was. But if you are trying to establish the fact that I had associations with persons who were known to me as either members of the Communist Party, or at least pretty close to the Communist Party, then I think I did associate with such people.

Senator JENNER. Name some of them.

Senator JOHNSTON. Didn't you go just a step further than that? You aided them and advised them how to organize and go forward. Didn't you also do that?

Mr. MORRIS. I call your attention, Senator, to the fact the word "organization" in that 1 paragraph is underscored 3 times.

Mr. TSURU. As I said earlier, under the circumstances of the 1930's, I may have gone beyond the limits of what I considered to be my proper action. I was quite young, sort of adventurous, so I can well imagine myself in making such mistakes. But I was never a member of the Communist Party.

I have become increasingly critical of Marxism, let alone the Communist political policies, and such critical attitudes of mine are a matter of public records in Japan.

Mr. MORRIS. On that point, Mr. Tsuru, may I just mention here: You know the book the Theory of Capitalist Development by Paul M. Sweezy?

Mr. TSURU. Yes; I do.

Mr. MORRIS. You wrote part of that book; did you not?

Mr. TSURU. I did write an appendix to that book.

Mr. MORRIS. That has just been republished, has it not, by the Monthly Review Press here in the United States?

Mr. TSURU. So I understand; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And hasn't Maurice Dobb, the famous economist in England, just written a very favorable review of that book?

Mr. TSURU. I have not read any book review by Mr. Dobb recently.

Mr. MORRIS. I read here from this book for which you have written an appendix:

This is the first comprehensive study of Marxian political economy in English. Out of print for several years, it is reprinted because of increasing demand. It should lead to better understanding of an enormously influential current of social thought which has often suffered from ignorant and superficial treatment.

I also might point out, in the accompanying circular there is a book recommended by Solomon Adler.

Mr. TSURU. May I comment on this point?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, Mr. Tsuru.

Mr. TSURU. The appendix I wrote for Mr. Sweezy's book I believe is called On Reproduction Schemes. It is a comparison of re-

production schemes of three economists: One is Quesnay, another is Karl Marx, and another is John M. Keynes. And it is extremely, as I consider it, a technical treatment of the manner in which three economists in the past have dealt with the question of social flow of commodities in a simplified form.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel, will you continue reading the letter, please?

Mr. MANDEL (reading) :

It seems to me that the main cause of this failure lies in the fact that the group in question generally abhors organization and that we did not accommodate our policy to that characteristic. Tied up with their abhorrence to organization is the fact that most of them have very specific organization is the fact that most of them have very specific interest, especially in the case of professional groups. Engineers are first of all interested in engineering. Social case workers are interested more in psychiatry than in dialectic materialism in general. Now, to meet this special circumstance, the flexible form of study groups, in my opinion, is a most appropriate answer. These study groups shall originate, needless to say through our initiative, along the most natural and easy tie of association. For instance, the Korb's group in Cambridge arose among those who were dissatisfied in the Marx seminale. Lunning's group arose among the members of the law school. A group may originate through the fact of professional homogeneity, like in the case of social caseworkers. A group may originate through the preexisting social ties. A study group on Plato may turn into a study group on Marx, as has been done this summer in Madison. In short, study groups will avoid the formal aspect of organization as much as possible and make use of the special interests which professional groups possess. The Association of Marxian Studies can come only after this. It will turn out to be harmful or ineffective if we organize the association too prematurely in any particular locality. In either case, the magazine serves as a weapon for promoting, as well as in conducting and developing, such study groups.

No less important than the foregoing point, however, is the necessity of leading ordinary members of these study groups into a more mature form of organization or of activities. To be a member of a study group may be a step toward enrolling the worker's school; it may be a step toward joining the American League Against War and Fascism; it may be a step toward becoming a member of YCL or of the party. It is absolutely necessary to keep a study group from becoming a self-perpetuating, stagnant cloister for the few.

As to the relation between the educational activities centered around the magazine and those of the worker's schools, I do not think there is any conflict or duplication. The former apply to those groups which usually cannot be reached by the worker's school on account of their abhorrence to organization or of their too specific an interest.

Now, as to what has been done in Madison and Chicago. In Madison, the practical step has been already taken, although the major portion of it will not be effected until the university opens in September. At present, there are three study groups going. Two among members of the Farm Labor Progressive Federation, one using Corey's *The Decline of American Capitalism*, and the other Engels' *Anti-Duhring*. The first group consists mainly of clerical workers. The third group is among students of the university; it has been carried on during the summer session in the form similar to that of the group on dialectic materialism in Cambridge. The teacher's unit appointed a special committee headed by the agent for the magazine to outline concrete avenues of approach in the educational activities centered around the magazine. The report has been submitted and the discussion on it is going on. In Chicago the practical step has not yet been taken. There the question of cooperation with the worker's school has to be settled. In fact, a member of its staff, I am informed, has expressed in his casual talk a sense of alarm at the possibility of duplication. I think that such an alarm is largely based upon the misunderstanding of the nature of study groups which the association is to organize. Miss Constance Kyle, who probably will act as the main agent for the magazine in the Chicago district, tells me that there are many possibilities of study groups among those people whom the school will not be able to reach effectively. The association will not go beyond filling such a gap. On this matter, I shall try to discuss with the staff of the

school when I go to Chicago in a few days, and shall report to you on the result. But meanwhile, I think it will help a great deal toward clarifying the matter here if you let me know as soon as possible your reaction to my report above. In the matter of the association, as well as in that of the magazine, I have constantly asked for suggestions of K. H. Niebyl.

In order to facilitate—

Senator JOHNSTON. Wait a minute. Who was Niebyl?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Niebyl was an economist whom I met for the first time, I think, in the summer of 1933 in Madison, Wis. He was studying economics at the University of Wisconsin at the time.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know him to be a Communist?

Mr. TSURU. I had suspicion that he was pretty close to—I knew he had come from Germany after Hitler's coming into power, so anyone who has been sort of ousted, or came out of Germany under Hitler, I interpreted it to be sort of leftish. And from conversations, I gathered that he was pretty close to the Communist activities.

Mr. MORRIS. To answer your question, Senator Johnston, Karl H. Niebyl is a director of economics section and publication sections of the Editor Review and Forecast; has a Doctor of Philosophy degree from the University of Wisconsin; Master of Arts degree from the University of Frankfurt; was a fellow in economics, University of Wisconsin; has also done graduate studies at the University of London, London School of Economics, and the University of Paris, University of Frankfurt, and University of Berlin. He became assistant professor of economics in Carleton College, and later on he became the economic adviser on monetary and fiscal policies for the Advisory Commission to the Council on National Defense. He is an associate professor of economics and chairman of the graduate department of economics at Tulane University, where we presume he now is, Senator. I do not know exactly. And his name appears in the Abraham Lincoln School catalog in the fall of 1943, whence this information I have just read is taken.

Senator JOHNSTON. Fine. Proceed.

Mr. MANDEL (reading further) :

In order to facilitate the task of the agent in Chicago in coordinating the campaign in the adjoining districts, I should like you to send us immediately the list of names and addresses of those persons in the Middle West district whom you have already contacted. Especially persons connected with the universities.

All the subscribers around here are eagerly looking forward to the appearance of the magazine. I hope that the first issue will be published in October as has been promised, and not in November or December!

Signed "Sincerely, Tsuru."

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Senator, I think the answer from Mr. Parry to Mr. Tsuru to that letter is important, particularly because of this paragraph. I would like this to be offered with that first letter, Senator, because the two are together.

If I may read this one paragraph?

Senator JOHNSTON. Proceed.

Mr. MORRIS (reading) :

On the matter of the study groups discussed in your last letter especially
* * * —

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Morris, could you tell us which one—

Mr. MORRIS. This is the answer of September 6. This is the letter that is probably appended to the first one. [Reading:]

On the matter of the study groups discussed in your last letter especially: I do not see how there can be any doubt that such study groups are a very desirable thing. Unquestionably they can bring in many people who would not go to the workers school. They do not conflict with the workers school. It is the duty of the more advanced members of the groups to draw the others closer to the revolutionary movement by involving them in activities, as you suggest. If anyone raises any objection to these study groups—

Senator JOHNSTON. Wait a minute. What do you mean by "revolutionary movement"?

Mr. TSURU. This is not my writing.

Senator JENNER. This is in reply.

Senator JOHNSTON. It is an answer to you, though. He is talking to you about the matter, and he expects you to understand what it means.

Mr. TSURU. I do not think I mentioned about revolution in my letter.

Senator JOHNSTON. I know you did not, but he is writing back to you.

Mr. MORRIS. And attributing it to you.

Mr. TSURU. Well, if it is in answer to my letter, you see, he is attributing something which I did not mention.

Senator JOHNSTON. I know, but how do you answer that?

Mr. TSURU. He is attributing more than—

Senator JOHNSTON. That shows what he is thinking about the letter which you wrote to him.

Mr. TSURU. I cannot conjecture about his own mind.

Senator JOHNSTON. What is that?

Mr. TSURU. I cannot conjecture as to Mr. Parry's—

Senator JOHNSTON. I do not think there is much conjecture in there. I think he realizes what he is talking to you about, and I think you realize what he is talking about, too.

Mr. TSURU. I think my intention at the time, if you would like me to answer as fully as I can, was to make Science and Society a success as a magazine. And once I set my mind to doing so, I did it as—

Senator JOHNSTON. Success for whom?

Mr. TSURU. Success—well, from my own point of view, I think I have already said it before, but, I was very much interested in upsetting the Japanese program of invasion in China, and I was quite adventurous in that respect.

If you ask me about the positions I did take in those days, or earlier, some of these letters which I just left back, it is very difficult for me to justify now because I entirely take a different position at present. And at present, you see, my views on these matters are so different that it is really painful for me. I know it is a duty for me to answer your questions but it is painful for me to try to develop all the ramifications of those excesses which I committed.

If you ask my present views, then it is much easier for me. And especially, Mr. Parry says, "revolutionary movement"; I did not say it. What I was trying to do, I think, in this exchange of letters with Mr. Parry was to make Science and Society a success. That was—I think that must have been, my intention in writing such letters.

Mr. MORRIS. When you refer in your article, of January 1954, as to the "stealthy footsteps of America," what do you mean by that? You took a position, Mr. Tsuru, did you not, opposing the position

of the United States in implementing the United Nations Resolution on Genocide and criticizing the Anglo-Americans for deliberately distorting the not unreasonable reply of November 1954 of the Soviet Union.

Do you remember that article?

Mr. GLOVER. Do you have a copy of it, Mr. Morris?

Mr. MORRIS. Not with me. I will have it for you tomorrow.

Mr. TSURU. I think I do remember it.

May I answer that question?

Senator JOHNSTON. Surely.

Mr. TSURU. I think Mr. Morris has referred to two aspects of the article. One was the question of genocide; the other was a question of the failure of the United States and United Kingdom Government to reply to the Soviet note of November 1954—failed to reply promptly.

Now, as to the question of genocide, we are very much concerned about that question in Japan. The Japanese Army itself has been suspected of trying to develop the genocide weapon during the Second World War, and I have no authentic proof, but I have a suspicion that at least they tried to do so.

So, when various indications arose as to the use of genocide weapons—I am sorry, the genocide weapon is the weapon which kills a large number of people—

Mr. MORRIS. The genocide resolution is, of course, the resolution to the eliminating of a whole nation.

Mr. TSURU. May I retract what I said? I was under a misunderstanding.

Mr. MORRIS. Perhaps you would like to let your answer go until you see the article fully, Mr. Tsuru.¹

Mr. TSURU. I think I can recall, however, because I think I can guess what you are trying to make me answer.

I have been known as an anti-American in Japan in the postwar. Because I think I have expressed my views publicly as regards a number of problems to which America has been closely connected.

One is the question of experimental explosion of nuclear weapons; the other the question of the political restrictions on Japan's trade with mainland China. Another is the question of the United States foreign policy as a whole.

Mr. MORRIS. Mainland China being what we know as Red China?

Mr. TSURU. I use the words "mainland China" because the United Nations use that expression in referring to the Continent of China.

And another one is with respect to the question of so-called strings attached to the American aid.

On these number of questions I have expressed my views in public, and the passage which Mr. Morris read refers to, I believe—

Senator JOHNSTON. When you say "strings attached to foreign aid" what do you mean there?

Mr. TSURU. You would like—

Senator JOHNSTON. I would like to know just what you mean.

Mr. TSURU. I criticized that aspect especially in connection with what we call mutual security agreement between Japan and the

¹ Following the hearing Mr. Tsuru furnished the subcommittee with a copy of the article which was placed in the files.

United States. We received aid of wheat in the first instance from the United States under the mutual security agreement. Subsequently, such aid of wheat shipment was formalized in the form of surplus agricultural disposal, and which I think the Japanese Government negotiated already about three times.

The mechanism of the aid is to ship, let us say, American wheat or cotton to Japan, sell these products to the Japanese against Japanese local currency, and this local currency is accumulated as a counterpart fund, and this counterpart fund is used to fill various purposes for the development of Japan.

Now the part I objected to most was the degree of control which America seems to have insisted on on the disposal of the counterpart funds. I felt, if it was to be an aid from the United States, and it was called an aid, I felt it would be best for the mutual relations between the United States and Japan if the disposal of the counterpart fund was entirely left in the hands of the Japanese Government, whereas, the use of the counterpart fund, to a greater degree, was controlled by the United States, especially in the direction at first of expanding Japanese armaments.

I hold the view, even now, that Japan should not arm too fast, and I had various indications that the United States Government was pressing the Japanese Government to arm beyond what I would consider the proper limit at the present time, especially in view of the fact we have the article IX in our Constitution which clearly states that we renounce war and have no armaments, either of land, sea, or air, in the future.

So I called such a degree of controls over surplus disposal counterpart funds as "strings attached."

Senator JENNER. Counterpart fund, though, is a fund owned by the United States Government, isn't it? They belong to us, why should you have the say about spending our money?

Mr. TSURU. Excuse me, Senator. According to the agricultural surplus disposal negotiations, I believe the counterpart fund is regarded as a loan by the United States Government to the Japanese Government. It is a loan, a loan repayable either in yen or dollars. If it is to be repaid in dollars, then the rate of interest is lower than if we repaid in yen. But it is a loan.

Senator JENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this witness a question. He says he is going to be on the Voice of America program right away.

Have you prepared your manuscript yet for the Voice of America?

Mr. TSURU. I have not—the suggestion came to me, I believe, before I received a subpoena from your committee. I agreed to do so, and the date was set for April 18. So I thought it was a very good opportunity for me to express my—

Senator JENNER. Anti-American views?

Mr. TSURU. No, sir.

Senator JENNER. Well you said you were known as an anti-American.

Mr. TSURU. I said I was known, but I was trying to explain what my position was, and I was sort of interrupted.

Senator JENNER. I do not quite understand some of your explanations. Are you here on a United States Government grant?

Mr. TSURU. No, sir.

Senator JENNER. How are you here at Harvard University now?

Mr. TSURU. Well I think I explained it at first. I am on the American-Japan intellectual interchange program.

Senator JENNER. Would you tell us a little more about that?

Mr. TSURU. I personally do not know the details of this program.

Senator JENNER. Who furnishes the money?

Mr. TSURU. It is operated by Columbia University.

Senator JENNER. Columbia?

Mr. TSURU. And I think it is—well, since I do not know the details probably I should not say so. That is the extent I needed to know. And under this program, I was to be a visiting lecturer at Harvard University.

But, Mr. Chairman, I was trying to explain earlier my position and I was interrupted. I would like to finish it if I may?

Senator JENNER. Your position on what?

Senator JOHNSTON. On what?

Mr. TSURU. On what I was called or regarded as an anti-American in Japan, and also the question—

Senator JENNER. But you are not anti-American?

Mr. TSURU. Not anti-American. You see, I have been criticized as being anti-American.

Senator JOHNSTON. Who criticized you as being anti-American?

Mr. TSURU. Well I have indications—I do not recall any definite printed version of this, but I have indications that I have been regarded as an anti-American. But I just wanted to finish it very briefly, what I was trying to say—

Senator JOHNSTON. So much so as to have invited you into the Communist Party, isn't that right?

Mr. TSURU. The Communist Party?

Senator JOHNSTON. They never did invite you to join the Communist Party?

Mr. TSURU. Never.

Senator JOHNSTON. No one? No one ever discussed anything about that?

Mr. TSURU. No one did.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, may I just finish that last sentence that I was reading here? [Reading:]

It is the duty of the more advanced members of the groups to draw the others closer to the revolutionary movement by involving them in activities, as you suggest. If anyone raises any objection to these study groups, see to it that his position is corrected, if necessary appealing to the district leadership.

Now isn't that advice to you to take the problem up with the district leadership of the Communist Party if you have any dissension whatever in following out your plan?

Mr. TSURU. Well here again, the only way I can answer, I think, is I committed excesses, and I had committed mistakes in widening too much my association with various people, and probably I was too eager to make Science and Society a success at the time. But truthfully, I never was a member of the Communist Party; I never identified anyone as a member.

Senator JENNER. When you got a letter like that, referring to taking it up with the district leadership, to whom did you think he was directing his remarks? Was there any doubt in your mind, did you question him about it? Who was the district leadership he was referring to in his reply to your letter?

Mr. TSURU. I was concerned only with Science and Society, and I suppose I interpreted this—

Senator JENNER. Did you tell him that you were not interested in district leadership, you were only concerned with Science and Society? Did you tell this gentleman that?

Mr. TSURU. No.

Senator JENNER. No?

Mr. TSURU. Excuse me, may I answer it?

Senator JENNER. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. I was interested in Science and Society, mainly, so probably I interpreted the sentence to mean so far as Science and Society is concerned.

Senator JENNER. Did the Science and Society have a district leadership?

Mr. TSURU. No, it did not, sir. Well, we had a number of people who were interested in developing this magazine, Science and Society, in different districts.

Senator JENNER. Yes, a journal dedicated to the growth of Marxism scholarship. Isn't that the purpose of Science and Society, a journal dedicated to the growth of Marxian scholarship?

Mr. TSURU. I think that was the purpose of the Science and Society at the time. But may I say, as I understand Marxism, and as I understand it now—Marxism, I understand it as a body of doctrines which contains a number of elements. I was interested mainly in the economic analysis part. I should say that Marx's contributions can be generally classified into three parts: His vision, his analysis of the society, and his political programs. I was mainly interested in the analysis of the society part, and so far as Marx's analysis of social development was concerned, I was a student of it.

I did make various studies myself. I tried to test hypotheses of Marx as regards the development of society, especially in terms of Japan. And I found some of these hypotheses applied to the case of Japan, especially during the period of development from feudalism to capitalism in the mid-19th century. As a man in the profession of scholarship, I wanted to keep on testing the hypotheses on various parts of the world. But I have taken the position, even then and now much more strongly than before, some of the hypotheses, even in this economic analysis part of Karl Marx, were entirely wrong. For example, the thesis that the working class would become increasingly poor as capitalism develops. I hold the view that his diagnosis in this regard is entirely wrong, opposite to the fact.

Marx says that there is a tendency toward a falling rate of profit under capitalism. I also question it.

Mr. MORRIS. You question it now, or you questioned it then?

Mr. TSURU. I question it now, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Senator, I think maybe Mr. Tsuru misunderstands our asking about these particular memorandums. We came upon these recently, Senator, in connection with another inquiry that is going on, and they reflected the intimate detailed organization of an important portion of the Communist Party as operating in the late 1930's and 1940's in the United States.

One of the persons that we have seen so far, at least went on to what seems to be an important Government office from there. There are names throughout these papers that are of great interest to us. Some

of these people have been, in the late 1950's, witnesses before the committee, and apparently, were still then Communists. It details a great deal of information and evidence which is going to be very helpful to the committee.

Now it occurred to us, Senator, that the man who wrote these letters, particularly later on when he talks about comrades and party factions, that obviously such a man writing these letters must, himself, be right in the middle of the whole thing.

So, we want from Mr. Tsuru, a detailed expression as to what went on. Perhaps his information will tell us a great deal about the present Communist organizations now going on.

And I think that your reference to what your present position is now in connection with Marx or something, is nothing, Mr. Tsuru, that is of interest to us. What we are interested in is the Communist Party as it is now operating in the United States.

Mr. TSURU. Now operating in the United States?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, as reflected by these papers that you have identified are yours, and with the aid of which, I think you told us, you were going to tell who the Communists were whom you knew and worked with at that time.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Morris, if I may, there is a 20-year interval between these letters, and now—

Mr. MORRIS. They were left in 1942. These letters go up to 1942.

Mr. GLOVER. The ones we are looking at now are dated 1936.

Mr. MORRIS. This particular one. Now, as you know, Mr. Parry was teaching at Harvard in 1953, and, apparently, the evidence indicated he was still a Communist. Now, Mr. Niebyl, you indicated you suspected was a Communist; is that right?

Mr. TSURU. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. And there is, as you will notice back here later on, a whole breakup of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 study groups which you were then writing to Mr. Niebyl about—I do not know whether that was up in Cambridge—which included over 100 people. Now, perhaps you will tell us about all those things.

Senator JOHNSTON. I would like to call attention to the attorney that the Senate is in session and is really meeting right now. I suppose this might be a good place to break and come back tomorrow, and it will give him time to read his manuscripts here, and identify them for the record tomorrow.

Mr. MORRIS. All right, Senator. I would like to offer for the record at least those two letters, the letter of Mr. Tsuru and the reply from Mr. Parry. I would like those to go into the record before we adjourn.

Senator JOHNSTON. They shall become a part of the record.

(The letters referred to were marked "Exhibit Nos. 442 and 443" and are as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 442

At present: Madison
But please answer care of The International House 1414 E. 59th Street,
Chicago, Illinois

AUGUST 31, 1936.

DEAR BILL (W. T. PARRY): "Thus far I have not reported to you anything concerning the matter of the Association of Marxian Studies, mainly because the entire matter in this district has been only in the formative stage both with re-

spect to its theory and practice. It still is. For a definite reason, however, I feel it necessary to report immediately the major problems which have arisen here in connection with the matter of organizing the Association.

First, I shall try to formulate my understanding of the nature of the educational activities centered around the magazine. The publication of the magazine itself, without the Association or study groups around it, has its educational significance. The prospectus is sufficiently clear in this regard. It is as regards the aspect in the use of the magazine as an active propaganda weapon that I should like to develop further.

We have already various forms of organization for the educational purposes, e. g., the Worker's School. The existing forms are adapted mainly for the members of the working class and the lower middle class or for the members of the party and YCL. For the fairly large group of professionals and the majority of the middle class, however, we either have not developed an effective organization or have tried to develop one without success. It seems to me that the main cause for this failure lies in the fact that the group in question generally abhor organization and that we did not accommodate our policy to that characteristic. Tied up with their abhorrence to organization is the fact that most of them have very specific interest, especially in the case of professional groups. Engineers are first of all interested in engineering. Social caseworkers are interested more in psychiatry than in dialectic materialism in general. Now, to meet this special circumstance, the flexible form of study groups, in my opinion, is a most appropriate answer. These study groups shall originate, needless to say, through our initiative, along the most natural and easy tie of association. For instance, the Korb's group in Cambridge arose among those who were dissatisfied in the Marx seminare. Lunning's group arose among the members of the Law School. A group may originate thru the fact of professional homogeneity, like in the case of social caseworkers. A group may originate thru the preexisting social ties. A study group on Plato may turn into a study group on Marx, as has been done this summer in Madison. In short, study groups will avoid the formal aspect of organization as much as possible and make use of the special interests which professional groups possess. The Association of Marxian Studies can come only after this. It will turn out to be harmful or ineffective if we organize the Association too prematurely in any particular locality. In either case, the magazine serves as a weapon for promoting, as well as in conducting and developing such study groups.

No less important than the foregoing point, however, is the necessity of leading ordinary members of these study groups into a more mature form of organization or of activities. To be a member of a study group may be a step toward enrolling the Worker's School; it may be a step toward joining the American League against War and Fascism; it may be a step toward becoming a member of YCL or of the party. It is absolutely necessary to keep a study group from becoming a self-perpetuating, stagnant cloister for the few.

As to the relation between the educational activities centered around the magazine and those of the Worker's Schools, I don't think there is any conflict or duplication. The former apply to those groups which usually cannot be reached by the Worker's School on account of their abhorrence to organization or of their too specific an interest.

Now, as to what has been done in Madison and Chicago. In Madison, the practical step has been already taken, although the major portion of it will not be effected until the University opens in September. At present, there are three study groups going. Two among members of the Farmer Labor Progressive Federation, one using Corey's *The Decline of American Capitalism* and the other Engels' *Anti-Dühring*. The first group consists mainly of clerical workers. The third group is among students of the University; it has been carried on during the summer session in the form similar to that of the group on dialectic materialism in Cambridge. The teacher's unit appointed a special committee headed by the agent for the magazine to outline concrete avenues of approach in the educational activities centered around the magazine. The report has been submitted and the discussion on it is going on. In Chicago, the practical step has not yet been taken. There the question of cooperation with the Worker's School has to be settled. In fact, a member of its staff, I am informed, has expressed in his casual talk a sense of alarm at the possibility of duplication. I think that such an alarm is largely based upon the misunderstanding of the nature of study groups which the Association is to organize. Miss Constance Kyle, who probably will act as the main agent for the magazine in the Chicago district, tells me that there are many possibilities of study groups among those

people whom the School will not be able to reach effectively. The Association will not go beyond filling such a gap. On this matter, I shall try to discuss with the staff of the School when I go to Chicago in a few days, and shall report to you on the result. But, meanwhile, I think it will help a great deal toward clarifying the matter here if you let me know as soon as possible your reaction to my report above. In the matter of the Association, as well as in that of the magazine, I have constantly asked for suggestions of K. H. Niebyl.

In order to facilitate the task of the agent in Chicago in coordinating the campaign in the adjoining districts, I should like you to send us *immediately* the list of names and addresses of those persons in the Middle West district whom you have already contacted, especially persons connected with universities.

All the subscribers around here are eagerly looking forward to the appearance of the magazine. I hope that the first issue will be published in October as has been promised, and not in November or December!

Sincerely,

(TSURU).

EXHIBIT No. 443

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY: A MARXIAN QUARTERLY

6½ Holyoke Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts

SEPT. 6, 1936.

DEAR TSURU: Please do not think from the fact that we have been somewhat negligent about answering your letters that we do not appreciate them, and your numerous activities for the magazine. On the contrary, we find them to be very valuable. However, Kenneth and I have been out of town now and then; and, with most everyone away, I have not been able to get anyone to do typing, etc., for me most of the time. Also, we have a last-minute rush at present, since the magazine is going to the printer this week. I can assure you, therefore, by the way, that the first issue will actually appear in October—in fact, about the first of October.

On the matter of the study groups discussed in your last letter especially: I do not see how there can be any doubt that such study groups are a very desirable thing. Unquestionably they can bring in many people who would not go to the Workers School. They do not conflict with the Workers School. It is the duty of the more advanced members of the groups to draw the others closer to the revolutionary movement by involving them in activities, as you suggest. If anyone raises any objection to these study groups, see to it that his position is corrected, if necessary appealing to the district leadership.

The organization of these study groups, I think, should be flexible, following natural lines as you indicate, and the Association should not be too formal at first. Such study groups and *Science & Society* will mutually help one another's development.

We have not very many people in the Middle West who have agreed to work for the magazine besides those you and Niebyl know about. Miss Constance Kyle can count on help from Joseph Doob (math.), also of Univ. of Illinois. Prof. J. F. Brown, Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. (psych.) will help. These 2 we know to be reliable people. Brown has given us names of psychologists, to whom we have sent prospectuses. (In the Midwest, he listed the following as "probably very sympathetic": I. Krechevsky, U. of Chicago; N. R. F. Maier, Univ. of Michigan; Ross Stagner, Univ. of Akron, Akron, O.)

Frederick L. Ryan, Assoc. Prof. of Economics, Univ. of Oklahoma (Address: Faculty Exchange, Norman, Okla.), wrote us that he will help, and will try to start a group to support magazine.

Mins may have some other names. But I suggest one of you write to him, stating a little more exactly what sort of information you need (e. g., do you want lists of subscribers?), and what territory is included.

With regard to Great Britain, J. D. Bernal of U. of Cambridge (68 Walnut Tree Ave., Cambridge, Engl.) has agreed to be our agent. H. Levy of Univ. of London is also acting as a Foreign Editor. We have written to (or will write to) about a dozen outstanding Marxists. However, we can always use more contacts. But I suggest that any *extensive* campaign for subs, or any suggestions for articles, be first discussed with us, or directly with Bernal (preferably the former where possible).

Will you please make it clear to the people you communicate with who are serving as agents for the magazine that we prefer to have business matters (including subs.) sent directly to Mins, at 10 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., and editorial matters left to this office. (But they may send us a single letter if they have to deal with both kinds.) (Book reviews may be handled thru either office.)

Thanks for all your assistance. I shall be seeing you soon.

Yours,

/s/ BILL PARRY (WILLIAM T.).

Mr. GLOVER. Is there any possibility, Mr. Chairman, since this witness is from out of town, that we could continue this afternoon?

Senator JOHNSTON. It will be impossible. Here is the trouble, we have a rule that we are not supposed to meet while the Senate is in session. I do not believe so. What do you think?

Senator JENNER. I would not think so.

Senator JOHNSTON. As for me, I just do not think it would be possible.

Mr. TSURU. If you are going to recess, may I just say a word?

Senator JOHNSTON. Yes, sir, but try to be brief, because we do have to leave here.

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

I have agreed, as I wrote to Senator Eastland by personal letter, that I am willing to testify, cooperate with the committee to the best of my ability. And I have tried to do so this morning, and I shall continue to do so in the future. However, I am here on the American-Japan intellectual interchange program, which I consider to be very important.

And—I was interrupted earlier—on the Voice of America program, I was going to say my impressions of America, in which I was going to include my sense of surprise about the vigor of the economic development, the degree of prosperity you have. In general, I was going to do my best to cement and promote the interests of the cultural interchange between our two countries.

Now, I consider my job as such, a cultural interchange man, quite important. So, though I shall be at your service any time you would like me to come, I would appreciate very much if you could also let me carry out some of the commitments I have under this program.

Senator JOHNSON. We will try our best to finish tomorrow.

Mr. MORRIS. Particularly, Mr. Tsuru, if you will look at these letters, so we can go through them all at great length.

Senator JOHNSTON. The committee stands adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, March 27, 1957.)

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1957

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:45 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator Jenner, presiding.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; William A. Rusher, associate counsel; J. G. Sourwine, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Senator JENNER. The committee will come to order.

Proceed with the testimony of the witness. The witness was sworn yesterday so this is a continuation.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tsuru has requested an opportunity to read a statement here.

Senator JENNER. You may proceed.

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Chairman, at yesterday's hearings the questions asked me ranged over a time span of more than 25 years, often without regard to chronology. To put matters in perspective, I would like to make this statement at the beginning of today's hearing.

1. I am a Japanese citizen, and a professor of economics at Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo. I took my undergraduate and graduate training in the United States, receiving the following degrees from Harvard University in the years indicated (bachelor of arts, 1935; master of arts, 1936; doctor of philosophy, 1940). In 1941, when war broke out, I was a research assistant in the economics department at Harvard. My wife and I were not interned but were subsequently repatriated on the *Gripsholm* in June, 1942.

2. I am currently on leave of absence from Hitotsubashi University in order to come to this country under the American-Japanese intellectual interchange program, a privately sponsored program, to do economic research at Harvard, give some guest lectures, and generally reacquaint myself with a country which I have not seen for 15 years.

Senator JENNER. You will furnish this committee the method by which you came here, who is financing it, and so forth.

Mr. TSURU. I will do so, sir.¹ I shall continue reading.

3. In the postwar years in Japan I served as an economist in SCAP (1946-47).

¹ A statement regarding the Intellectual Interchange program, which Mr. Tsuru said was prepared by Prof. Hugh Borton, chairman of the American committee, is printed as appendix I of this volume.

Senator JENNER. That was under General MacArthur?

Mr. TSURU. Yes. When a coalition Cabinet was formed in 1947 under Premier Katayama, I was asked to become Vice Minister of Economic Stabilization. In that capacity I helped to initiate measures to curb inflation in Japan, measures which, incidentally, were vigorously opposed by Japanese Communists.

4. I am not "anti-American" unless that term can be extended to include one who, as a Japanese citizen, on occasion publicly differs with specific United States policies, such as the test explosion of nuclear bombs in the Pacific, severe restrictions on trade between Japan and mainland China, and emphasis on Japanese rearmament.

Senator JENNER. May I interrupt right there?

Mr. TSURU. Yes, sir.

Senator JENNER. You have made public statements, I assume, in regard to the explosion of nuclear tests by the United States Government.

Mr. TSURU. I have written articles for publication on the opinion of mine regarding this question, not only the tests by the United States Government, but by all the governments.

Senator JENNER. In other words, it is public knowledge you have written on it.

Mr. TSURU. Yes. May I continue.

Senator JENNER. Sure.

Mr. TSURU. Since my return to the United States I have become aware, through firsthand observation, of the vitality and the potentiality for growth of the American economy and have written, for example, an article for ASAHI, Japan's leading newspaper, reporting, from an economist's viewpoint, the extremely high standard of living in the United States, and the increasing emphasis of American consumers on quality, rather than quantity. I am extremely grateful for the opportunity provided me by the exchange program to reacquaint myself with the United States, and I am sure I shall have occasions to prove this gratitude through my lectures and writings while in this country and after I return to Japan this fall.

5. As I have testified, I am not and never have been a member of the Communist Party. Attention has been called to a handful of letters written by, and to, me in 1936-37, some 20 years ago when I was a student at Harvard. These letters were apparently among the possessions which I left behind in my apartment in Cambridge when I was repatriated on the *Gripsholm*. During that period of time, as these letters indicate, I was acquainted with some individuals who were Communists or Communist-sympathizers, and, for a brief while I showed interest in the publication, Science and Society (some of whose editors were Communists), and in groups in Cambridge which discussed, among other things, Marxist doctrine.

Looking back over 20 years, I can only explain such interests during my student days in terms of youthful indiscretion of which I am ashamed.

I soon lost interest in Science and Society and saw less and less of those individuals in Cambridge and elsewhere who had been active in

it. As I matured, my attitudes changed. One of the major factors which influenced me in the direction of my current beliefs, which I would characterize as democratic socialism, was my realization, after the bold economic measures taken by the United States Government to curb the 1937-38 recession, of the constructive promises which the American system of economy seemed to hold for the future.

Although I would not in any way condone my youthful indiscretions during my student days, I consider that this experience enables me to hold to my present views with greater strength and confidence and to challenge Communist doctrines more effectively.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, that this hearing may be kept in perspective, I would like to bring into the record the evidence which Mr. Tsuru has been identifying, which indicates a very widespread and rather formidable infiltration in Americans, which is apparently continuing down to date.

Mr. Mandel has compiled a list of professors and their universities which indicates the spread with which Science and Society, the magazine, Science and Society, has been operating on our American campuses.

Also, we are not dealing here, Senator—these papers don't reveal youthful indiscretion or any such thing. The witness, in his own statement yesterday, was talking of the necessity of leading ordinary members of study groups into a more mature form of organization or activities. He went on say that to be a member of a study group may be a step toward enrolling in the workers' schools; maybe a step toward joining the American League Against War and Fascism. It may also be a step, he said, toward becoming a member of the Young Communist League or of the party. "It is absolutely necessary," said Mr. Tsuru, "to keep a study group from becoming a self-perpetuating stagnant cloister for the few."

I think, at the outset of the hearing today, Senator, Mr. Mandel should offer, for the record, a list of individuals with their colleges listed, who have been contributing editors—or let him furnish the description—to the publication Science and Society.

Mr. TSURU. May I interrupt a second?

Senator JENNER. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. I think Mr. Morris started out by saying, "Mr. Tsuru said yesterday"—now the letter was read yesterday in which the quotation was contained. The letter which I wrote in 1936.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; you acknowledged you had stated in 1936—

Mr. TSURU. Yes—

Senator JENNER. All right; proceed, Mr. Mandel.

Mr. MANDEL. The attached list of contributors to Science and Society shows the spread of the magazine among American colleges and universities. The tabulation is necessarily incomplete because we do not have all copies of the magazine available and because, in some instances, no college or university connection is given. It must be kept in mind that contributors listed may or may not be presently connected with the magazine and that they may or may not be presently connected with the college or university listed. Persons who contributed on more than one occasion are not repeated in the list.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 444" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 444

Writers for Science and Society

Issue	Name	University or college indicated
Winter 1939	J. W. Alexander Francis Birch Theodore B. Brameld Dorothy Brewster Ralph J. Bunche Addison T. Cutler E. Franklin Frazier Louis Harap Granville Hicks Eugene C. Holmes Leo Huberman Oliver Larkin Herbert M. Morais Broadus Mitchell Brooks Otis Herbert J. Phillips Samuel Sillen Harry C. Steinmetz Paul M. Sweezy Louis Weisner Edwin Berry Burgum Vladimir D. Kazakevich V. J. McGill Margaret Schlauch Bernhard J. Stern D. J. Struik	Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton. Harvard. Adelphi. Columbia. Howard. Fisk. Howard. Harvard. Do. Howard. Columbia. Smith. Brooklyn. Johns Hopkins. Hobard. Washington (State). New York. San Diego State. Harvard. Hunter. New York. Columbia. Hunter. New York. Columbia. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Harvard. Do. Wisconsin. Simmons. City College of New York. Williams. Washington (State). Howard.
Spring 1939	Robert K. Merton Walter B. Cannon Curtis P. Nettels Horace B. Davis Abraham Edel Paul Birdsall Elton P. Guthrie William O. Brown Alfred Lowe Leslie Reade Harold Chapman Brown Henry David Benjamin Paskoff Louis C. Hunter A. D. Winspear Lyman R. Bradley Alexander Sandow Katharine De Pre Lumpkin Joseph Kresh	New York. Stanford. Queens. City College of New York. American. Wisconsin. Brooklyn. New York. Smith. Brooklyn and City College of New York. Indiana. Kentucky. Columbia. Brooklyn. Do. City College of New York. Hunter. City College of New York Pennsylvania State. Toronto. Brooklyn. Carleton. Do. Adelphi
Fall 1939	Samuel Yellen Lester Tarnopol Charles Obermeyer Irving Mark Howard Selsam Lewis S. Feuer Charles Hughes Bailey W. Diffie Kingsley Davis Leopold Infeld Harry Slochower Karl H. Niebyl H. V. Cobb Francis Ballaine M. F. Ashley Montagu Mitchell Franklin George Herzog Marion Hathaway Alice D. Snyder Alan R. Sweezy Robert A. Brady Leslie C. Dunn Vernon Venable Carl O. Dunhar Norman Levinson	Hahnemann Medical. Tulane. Columbia. Pittsburgh. Vassar. Williams. California. Columbia. Vassar. Yale. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Wayne. New York. Columbia.
Winter 1940	Frank E. Hartung Lillian Herlands Hornstein S. Stanfield Sargent	
Spring 1940		
Do		
Summer 1940		
Winter 1942		
Spring 1942		
Summer 1942		
Fall 1942		
Spring 1943		
Summer 1943		
Winter 1944		
Spring 1944		
Summer 1944		

Writers for Science and Society—Continued

Issue	Name	University or college indicated
Fall 1944	T. Addis	Stanford, School of Medicine.
	Frederic Ewen	Brooklyn.
	Barrows Dunham	Temple.
	Selden C. Menefee	National.
Spring 1945	Charles E. Trinkaus, Jr.	Sarah Lawrence.
Summer 1945	Ernest Riesel	Hunter.
Fall 1945	Joseph W. Cohen	Colorado.
Spring 1947	John A. Wolfard	Montana State.
Summer 1947	Hans Gottschalk	Iowa.
	Oliver O. Cox	Tuskegee.
	Norman Cazden	Harvard.
	William Mandel	Stanford.
	Meyer Reinhold	Brooklyn.
Spring 1948	Morris Swadesh	City College of New York.
Fall 1948	Perez Zagorin	Amherst.
	Surendra J. Patel	Pennsylvania.
	Shou Shan Pu	Carleton.
Winter 1948-49	Ralph H. Gundlach	Washington (State).
	Wallace W. Douglas	Northwestern.
Spring 1949	Kenneth May	Carleton.
	Bernard F. Reiss	Brooklyn.
	W. T. Parry	Buffalo.
	Kirtley F. Mather	Harvard.
Summer 1949	Ray H. Dotterer	Pennsylvania State.
	Alvin W. Gouldner	Buffalo.
	Henry Aiken	Harvard.
Fall 1949	E. Burke Inlow	Princeton.
Spring 1950	Russell B. Nye	Michigan State.
Summer 1950	G. M. Gilbert	Princeton.
Fall 1950	Lullian Gilkes	New York.
Winter 1950-51	G. W. Sherman	Montana State.
	David V. Erdman	Minnesota.
Spring 1951	Otto Nathan	New York.
Fall 1951	Robert B. MacLeod	Cornell.
	Frank S. Freeman	Do.
	Alfred Young	Wesleyan.
	Vera Shlakman	Queens.
Winter 1951-52	Eda Lou Walton	New York.
	Kenneth Neill Cameron	Indiana.
	Ray Ginger	Western Reserve.
Spring 1952	Henry Pratt Fairchild	New York.
	Arthur K. Davis	Union.
	Ernest F. Patterson	Alabama.
Winter 1953	Norman Cazden	Illinois.
	Ray Ginger	Harvard.
Fall 1953	Philip Morrison	Cornell.
Winter 1954	William Appleman Williams	Oregon.
Winter 1955	Vernard Mandel	Penn.
	L. R. Lind	Kansas.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Senator, I might point out that in this list are people who have been identified as members of the Communist Party, many of whom, when asked under oath whether the specific evidence is accurate or inaccurate have claimed privilege under the fifth amendment. I might point out, Senator, that that process of congressional committees learning the identity of these men is something that has taken years to ascertain.

In a letter which has already been submitted to Mr. Tsuru on February 22, 1937—

Senator JENNER. Do you want to offer this list for the record?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Mandel has offered it.

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become an official part of the record.

Mr. MORRIS. Science and Society is still published?

Mr. MANDEL. Yes. I have here three issues of 1956 and if I may mention some names which appear in these issues—

Mr. MORRIS. Just offer them for the record.

Senator JENNER. They will go in to the record by reference and become an official part of this committee's record.

(The issues above referred to were numbered "Exhibit No. 445, 445-A and 445-B may be found in the subcommittee files.)

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to read from your [Tsuru's] letter of February 22, 1937, page 3.

Connie—

Who was Connie?

Mr. TSURU. This is Miss—she was then Miss—I don't know what happened to her subsequently, Miss Constance Kyle.

Mr. MORRIS. And she was a professor of psychiatry at the University of Illinois, was she not?

Mr. TSURU. University of Illinois or Chicago.

Mr. MORRIS. On that memorandum we come to later—

Mr. TSURU. Yes, I believe it says—

Mr. MORRIS. It says department of science at University of Illinois.

Mr. TSURU. Yes, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. May I continue reading?

Senator JENNER. Proceed.

Mr. MORRIS (reading):

Connie had expressed her anxiety, when she received a letter of acknowledgement from Miss Olson (a secretary to Mins)—

Now Mins is Henry Felix Mins, is he not?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. H. F. Mins, I don't know his second name.

Mr. MORRIS. There is a Mr. H. F. Mins associated with the magazine who has been identified in our record as a Communist and was called as witness in late 1952 and rather than answer, claimed his privilege under the fifth amendment. He was then a New York schoolteacher. I think the board of education subsequently took action and brought about his removal if he didn't resign.

And who was Miss Olson?

Mr. TSURU. Miss Olson, I do not know.

Mr. MORRIS (continuing):

as to the care with which the fraction and the official body are being distinguished. Not only your letter made it clear that the memorandum is addressed to the fraction, but I also repeated it verbally to Parry. Parry explained to me, however, practically all of the members of the editorial board either are or once were members of the party, and that the fraction and the editorial board are almost identical.

This fact itself reveals a shortcoming in my mind. Most concretely, the shortcoming came into light at the time our memorandum was brought down to New York. At that time most editors were terribly busy in other duties of theirs (in connection with the fight against Trotskyists) and, according to Parry, were not in the position to take up our memorandum for discussion immediately. My concrete suggestion is: the S. and S. should be able to enlist progressive intellectuals (who are not party members) who could make their activities in the S. and S. as their primary task. (The success of Left Book Club in England seems to me to be partially due to this factor.) I do not mean to say that our memorandum would have received a faster response had there been such persons active for the magazine; but I mean to say that the magazine and all other works connected with it (e. g. study groups) should not be solely in the hands of party members who are very often called to their duties even when they are needed in the magazine.

(The letter of February 22, 1937, was marked "Exhibit No. 446" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 446

36 CLAVERLY HALL, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

February 22, 1937.

DEAR KARL HEINRICH (NIEBYL): Connie has written me from Washington, telling me that Gertrude had returned to Chicago though not with complete recovery. At least, I am glad that her sickness was not very serious, but I hope she will take a good care of herself not to invite a relapse. You have been well as usual?

I remember that I promised you in my long letter of about three weeks ago to let you know about the situation in Cambridge more in detail so far as the matter of S&S is concerned.

At the beginning of the current schoolyear (October 1936), the situation was as follows: questions directly concerned with the magazine (such as, subscription, contribution) were almost exclusively in the single hands of W. T. Parry with some assistance from L. Harap, a contributing editor. Parry was doing even such things as contacting with, and carrying magazines, to various news stands. There was in existence, at that time, a very informal, loose organization called The Association of Marxist Studies which consisted of representatives (either approved or nonapproved) from each study group. Following study groups were represented in the Association:

Attendance

SG1, white collar workers' group socialists predominating text—Leontiev's <i>Pol. Ec.</i> -----	10-15
SG2, a group branched off from SG1 because the number of SG1 became too large text—the same as above-----	5
SG3, graduate students and instructors in the Economics Dept. text— Capital-----	5-8
SG4, graduate students and instructors in the Ec. Dept., some overlapping with SG3 seminar "Economics of Socialist Society"-----	5-8
SG5, graduate students from various depts. text—Lenin's works-----	5-10
SG6, graduate students from various depts. seminar "Dialectic Material- ism"-----	5
JRS1, John Reed Society classes, mostly undergraduates topic "Historical Materialism"-----	20-30
JRS2, John Reed Society class; mostly undergraduates topic "Current Events"-----	20-30

Except SG2 which emerged at the beginning of this current academic year, all the above groups existed during the last spring. As far as I know, the Association was the only place where various problems connected with study groups were discussed.

After the first issue of the magazine came out, it was suggested that the Association be transformed into Science and Society Club, especially because the leadership in the Association then was of stultifying type. The fact that the Association did practically nothing in the way of cooperating with S&S is to be explained, in my opinion, both in terms of the shrinking questim of the Association leadership and in terms of insufficient realization on the part of S&S of the necessity of cooperation with the Association. Through the transformation of the Association into the SSC, it was deemed that new blood could be injected into this sphere of activity, fusing more intimately the Association and S&S.

The first meeting of SSC was called at the beginning of December to discuss the first issue and S&S in general. Burgum came from New York to represent editors. There were about 20 people present. But because of the technical error, the matter of SSC was not broached until a few minutes before the closing hour of the Hall. Thus this meeting remained merely as a meeting called by the editors of S&S to discuss the magazine. At that time the number of subscribers in the state of Massachusetts was 101, according to the list submitted from New York.

During the month of January, the old members of the Association met a few times and voted to hold the second meeting of the subscribers and the SG members and their friends. At the beginning of February, the situation was as follows: As regards the matter of S&S, Parry was not completely single-handed, because Harap headed the committee on "A Guide to Marxian Studies," the bibliography projected. Following study groups were in existence: SG1; SG2 (now, taking up Lenin's *Teachings of Karl Marx* with sufficient amount of reference readings; the number of participants increased to 10); SG3; SG5 and SG6 combined into one dwindling in number and taking up the question of Fascism and

Social democracy; both JRS1 and JRS2 nominally existed but had not yet started their activities for the semester. In other words, no new groups and two less than before. But SG1 and SG2 not only grew as time went on, but also developed politically. SG1 is again ready to undergo "cell division."

The second general meeting to discuss S&S was held on Feb. 12. (The list of subscribers at that time numbered 128 in the state of Massachusetts, Cambridge accounting for about one-half of the number.) The discussion with the participation of Struik, Sweezy brothers, and Professors Leontief and Mason was quite lively. There were about 30 people present (two undergraduates, two or three non-University middle class intellectuals, the rest was graduate students and instructors of the University). But again the matter of SSC was not effectively brought up; thus the Club was not organized. Those undergraduates and white-collar workers who were present and could be taken as typical of their respective groups voiced the identical opinion after the meeting that both the magazine and the meeting were too "high brow" for them. The white-collar worker who voiced this opinion was one of the ablest members of SG1. He was the only one present out of all the members of SG1 and SG2.

In view of the above situation, I have made the following practical considerations:

(1) So far as Cambridge is concerned, what is most important is the drawing in of new blood. For this purpose, the unit which has been and still is somewhat aloof to the question of SG should reconsider its policy. Whether we shall form SSC or not is not so important as the question of the drawing in of new blood into the theoretical front and the question of the thorough-going reconsideration of the policy on study groups.

(2) As to the S&S as a whole, I should not like to make any additional remarks to what we said in our memorandum until we receive an answer from New York. But I am beginning to feel more strongly than before that present editors do not regard the S&S as a political weapon.

Connie had expressed her anxiety, when she received a letter of acknowledgment from Miss Olson (a secretary to Mins), as to the care with which the fraction and the official body are being distinguished. Not only your letter made it clear that the memorandum is addressed to the fraction, but I also repeated it verbally to Parry. Parry explained to me, however, practically all of the members of the editorial board either are or once were members of the Party, and that the fraction and the editorial board are almost identical.

This fact itself reveals a shortcoming in my mind. Most concretely, the shortcoming came into light at the time our memorandum was brought down to New York. At that time most editors were terrifically busy in other duties of theirs (in connection with the fight against Trotskyists) and, according to Parry, were not in the position to take up our memorandum for discussion immediately. My concrete suggestion is: the S&S should be able to enlist progressive intellectuals (who are not party members) who could make their activities in the S&S as their primary task. (The success of Left Book Club in England seems to me to be partially due to this factor.) I do not mean to say that our memorandum would have received a faster response had there been such persons active for the magazine; but I mean to say that the magazine and all other works connected with it (e. g. study groups) should not be solely in the hands of party members who are very often called to their duties even when they are needed in the magazine.

I wish to get your reaction to these problems, as well as to previous letters, as soon as you get some moments to scribble down. I am sending a copy of this letter to Connie.

Warmest greetings

(TSURU).

Mr. MORRIS. Now, you wrote that, did you not, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Chairman, since this is a copy, I cannot absolutely identify it but from internal evidence I am certain I wrote it.

Mr. MORRIS. And that would make it very clear that at that time you knew that the makeup of the board of Science and Society was made up virtually of members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TSURU. That is the way Parry told me, and since I have no way of checking on the matter and I was not especially interested on checking the matter at the time, I more or less took Mr. Parry's word for it.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, earlier in that memorandum you make——

Mr. TSURU. Memorandum?

Mr. MORRIS. Letter, I am sorry, February 22, 1937, letter, you mention the makeup of study groups in what you call the association. And there you mention, as follows:

	Attendance
SG1, white-collar-workers' group, Socialists predominating; text—Leon-tiev's Pol. Ec.	10-15
SG2, a group branched off from SG1, because the number of SG1 became too large; text—the same as above	5
SG3, graduate students and instructors in the Economics Dept.; text—Capital	5-8
SG4, graduate students and instructors in the Ec. Dept., some overlapping with SG3 seminar—Economics of Socialist Society	5-8
SG5, graduate students from various depts.; text—Lenin's works	5-10
SG6, graduate students from various depts.; seminar—Dialectic Materialism	5
JRS1, John Reed Society classes, mostly undergraduates; topic—Historical Materialism	20-30
JRS2, John Reed Society class, mostly undergraduates; topic—Current Events	20-30

Now, that totals more than 100, does it not, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. There might have been overlapping ones.

Mr. MORRIS. These are study groups that generally include material about Science and Society. You were then writing to Mr. Karl-Heinrich Niebyl at this time?

Mr. TSURU. Yes. I am not quite sure because as I recall, there was an attempt to organize this Association of Marxist studies which would not necessarily confine the attention to Science and Society. I personally felt at the time that Science and Society could be used for the association, as sort of rallying point, but certainly other books and magazine materials could be utilized for the purpose of study.

Mr. MORRIS. And as you said earlier in your letter—"with these study groups, however," of which you wrote in in your August 31 letter, August 31, 1936——

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS (continuing) :

is the necessity of leading ordinary members of these study groups into a more mature form of organization or activities. To be a member of a study group may be a step toward enrolling the Worker's School; it may be a step toward joining the American League Against War and Fascism; it may be a step toward becoming a member of YCL or of the party. It is absolutely necessary to keep a study group from becoming a self-perpetuating, stagnant cloister for the few.

In other words, as you suggested in your February 22 letter, were these people to be directed toward the Communist Party?

Mr. TSURU. May I answer this question——

Senator JENNER. You may.

Mr. TSURU (continuing). In slightly amplified form?

Senator JENNER. Certainly.

Mr. TSURU. From my experience in Japan as a member of the Anti-Imperialism League about which I related yesterday, I had a certain preconception about the publication of a magazine like Science and Society. That is to say to publish such a magazine and do nothing else would be meaningless. That was my idea. And I felt that if we are going to publish a magazine like Science and Society at all, we should do our utmost to introduce people into Science and Society and

through that association with Science and Society go into more political activities. That is a preconception which, I might say, I learned from my experience in the Anti-Imperialism League. That is the way I operated, for example, "operate" is not a very good word, but I worked in the Anti-Imperialism League, first introduced students into study groups, and then tried to persuade them to come into more active works like fighting against war in China.

Now, I carried over these preconceptions and at the time these letters were written, I can now see, although I did not remember before these letters were shown to me, I can now see I was strongly convinced of the importance of such matters. Therefore, I do not make any attempt to deny that in this period of 1936 —, in particular, I acted like a Communist, I spoke and wrote like a Communist. But as I said yesterday, I should like to state again, I never was a member, either of the Young Communist League or the Communist Party anywhere in the world.

In philosophic terms, I should consider myself that I was then a free agent, a free agent is a philosophical term, so do not misunderstand me if I use the word "agent"—free agent, I was free to decide on my own actions and ideas, not subject to any discipline by any organization.

MR. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer for the record, I would like to have go into the record—I haven't finished examining the witness on this point—the letter of September 6, 1936, to Mr. Tsuru.

SENATOR JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the official record.

(The document referred to is printed as exhibit 443 at page 3706.)

MR. MORRIS. I would like to have go into the record the letter of December 14, 1936, to Mr. Karl-Heinrich Niebyl.

SENATOR JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the official record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 447" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 447

36 CLAVERLY HALL, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

December 14, 1936.

DEAR KARL-HEINRICH (NIEBYL) : I write this letter with eager hope that I shall be able to see you in Chicago sometime during the Christmas vacation and to discuss some of the matters I mention below. I expect to arrive at Chicago on December 24th and to stay there or thereabouts at least until January 3rd.

As you might have heard, the subscription to S&S has gone over the figure of 1,500 and the total sale is exceeding 8,000, although the sale of over 10,000 seems to be necessary to make the magazine self-sustaining. (the above figures from the Managing Editor.) One piece of information, however, has "disturbed" us a little. That is, that most of the subs coming in recently are from the Middle West and Far West. Although some editors are commenting on this fact as 'a welcome good sign,' I observe two things. *Firstly*, we have failed in the eastern part of the country in organizing and systematizing the subscription drive. Knowing the way Connie was doing in Chicago or the way Herman and Cookson were doing in Madison, I think that the extent to which we paid our attention in the east to the question of subs has been extremely inadequate. (In November, it was estimated that about 30 percent of the total sub was from the state of New York and about 10 percent from that of Massachusetts.) I am trying my best within my power to mend this shortcoming. *Secondly*, the increasing subscription from the Middle West suggests to my mind immediately the lack of adequately coherent contacts between New York (which is now the headquarter for the magazine) and other districts throughout the country. In this connection, these specific problems come to my mind:

(1) the problem of Science and Society Clubs: you undoubtedly know the decision of the editorial board on the question. There has been a

new development in Cambridge, and S. S. C. has been organized. I should like to discuss with you further on this question when I see you.

(2) the nature of the magazine S&S: it is being discussed in Cambridge whether the primary emphasis is on the educational significance of S&S to the intelligentzia or on the academic research of Marxists.

(3) the problem of establishing the mechanism of contacts between N. Y. and other districts: I have suggested to W. T. Parry to bring this matter concretely at the next editorial meeting. I suggested that we should encourage in all the districts to establish a responsible agent whose primary task is to serve as a channel between the editorial board on the one hand and readers and contributors on the other. Such channels from all the districts are directed to N. Y. like spokes of a wheel; and there shall be a committee in N. Y. to receive them for coordinating purposes.

As to my article on Lange and Sweezy, I didn't hear from N. Y. for long time. So, I finally went down there to find out what's the matter with it. They seem to be agreed on publishing it with slight alterations, but apparently didn't take any action toward publishing it in the second issue. The article is now floating somewhere, and we are unable to trace it thus far. In any case, since the time I wrote that article, there has appeared Mises' book on *Wirtschafts-rechnung* in English translation and another article of Lange's in the October issue of *The Review of Economic Studies* on *The Economic Theory of Socialism*. Meanwhile, S&S has accepted, I hear, the review of Mises's book (above mentioned) by Paul Sweezy—the review which merely restates what Lange says in the above article. Thus, the extensive rewriting of my original article and publishing it in the third issue of S&S seems to me to be necessary. I hope I shall be able to prepare a rewritten manuscript before I leave here for Chicago, so that I can again call your assistance in straightening out my ideas.

As I hope you have been informed, the editorial board is planning to prepare *A Guide to Marxist Studies*. It "will serve to indicate the best expositions of Marxism and its implications for the special branches of knowledge. The Guide will therefore be neither exhaustive nor for the advanced student as such, but for the ordinary intelligent student of socialism." (quoted from the prospectus) The classification of contents, indicated in the prospectus, seemed to me to be very unsatisfactory. Thus we called a meeting in Cambridge to discuss that matter, and arrived at an alternative suggestion to which the Chairman (for preparing this Guide) still disagrees. The original classifications is in outline as follows:

1. General introduction
2. The United States:
 - a. History
 - b. Labor Movement
 - c. Political theory
 - d. Literature
3. The History of Socialism:
 - a. Doctrine
 - b. Revolutionary movements in Europe
 - c. Socialism in practice
4. Philosophy of Dialectic Materialism
5. Political Economy
6. The Sciences:
 - a. The Physical sciences
 - b. The sciences of human life
7. The Arts:
 - a. Literature
 - b. The fine arts
 - c. Music
 - d. Drama
 - e. Film
8. Law
9. Education
10. Periodicals
11. Index of Authors

The alternative I suggested is as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Dialectic Materialism:
 - a. Philosophy
 - b. Applications in natural sciences

3. Historical Materialism :

- a. Theory
- b. Application in general history
- c. Applications in Special fields of superstructure
 - (1) Political theory and law
 - (2) Sociology and anthropology
 - (3) Education
 - (4) Arts

4. History of Socialist Movements

5. Political Economy

6. Contemporary World Problems :

- a. Imperialism and colonial problems
- b. Fascism

7. Tactics of Revolutionary Movements

8. Socialism in Practice : U. S. S. R.

9. Periodicals

On this question also, I should like to have a discussion with you when I see you in Chicago.

I regret very much that I have not been able to fulfill the promise of sending you the list of whatever worthwhile references and materials which came to my attention. The reason for my failure is that I myself have been too busy during the semester to keep such things up to date.

Best wishes to Gertrude and Connie.

Looking forward to seeing you soon.

TSURU.

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to have go into the record the letter of August 31, 1936, to Mr. Bill Parry.

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the official record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 442" and appears at p. 3704).

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to have go into the record the letter of April 9, 1937, to Constance Kyle.

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the official record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 448" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT No. 448

36 CLAVERLY HALL,
Cambridge, Mass., April 9, 1937.

DEAR CONNIE [Constance Kyle]: Have you received an answer from N. Y. to our memorandum? I have repeatedly inquired Parry about it, but no avail. Finally I suggested that I shall go down to N. Y. in the weekend of April 10 to discuss the matter. Parry, who is now in N. Y. wrote me to-day that "I don't think it's worth your while to come down to N. Y. so far as S&S is concerned." He does not mention about the memorandum at all. Instead, he tells me that "Constance Kyle has only paid five dollars and some cents for 100 copies of the first issue, and is vague about the rest of the money. She doesn't seem to know even whether the copies have been sold or not." This is not the first time that my mention of memorandum was responded by their reference to you in one way or another. I have persistently repeated to Parry that the matter of the memorandum is of immediate and primary importance and that according to my impression their slow response is partly due to their slipshodness with which they distinguish the party fraction from the editorial board. The memorandum is addressed to the fraction; and it seems to me that it is a breach of discipline for them to have laid it aside for more than two months. I have no authority to say anything further on this matter. So, I hope that you and Karl-Heinrich will press this matter and work toward dispelling any misunderstandings.

With warmest regards

TSURU.

Also a copy to K. H. N. [Karl Heinrich Niebyl].

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to have go into the record the letter of April 14, 1937, to Shigeto.

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the official record.

(The document was marked "Exhibit No. 448-A" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 448-A

1430 HYDE PARK BLVD., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS,

April 14, 1937.

DEAR SHIGETO: I am enclosing a copy of the letter to Mins as the simplest way of showing you the present status of business aspect of SandS. This checks with New York accounts and settles funds to date. I don't know what you think of local sentiment on the single copy question but there is nothing final about it and we're open to suggestions and your opinion. It's quite possible that the sentiment among local agents suffers from some of the same difficulty as you mention in the Editorial Board—to many diverse demands on the time of our own people. However, I doubt if agents work will be taken on by any but our own people and it will certainly simplify the business details with the New York office if subs are sent from us and single copies are regarded as the province of regularly constituted book stores.

The following is a quote from Miss Olson's letter of Feb. 4th and the only reference I have received to the memorandum:

"The long letter of criticism, of which you were one of the signers, has just come down to the New York Editors. It will be considered very carefully by them and will undoubtedly be answered. They wish to thank you in advance for your part in the criticism, and to express their appreciation of your cooperation."

You'll know best how much they should be pushed for such an answer. The material included there on the contents of the first issue is of course more or less out dated by now. We would like to know of it if there has been any extensive use made by study groups elsewhere, and especially if any other Workers' School has some experience accumulated by now.

I've never been very clear as to what might be expected of us in the way of taking responsibility for territory outside of the city of Chicago. Frankly, Shigeto, it's a physical impossibility unless we can get more personnel involved. Let me know what you think should be done so that I can use it as a basis for discussion with responsible people locally to determine how they think we can manage it. It's highly probable they will veto any consideration of my dropping other work to follow this up in other cities. But lets get clear first on what needs to be done.

Hope we can look forward to your coming to the middle west as vacation time rolls around.

Sincerely,

/s/ CONSTANCE (KYLE).

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to have go into the record the letter of January 31, 1937, to Karl-Heinrich.

Senator JENNER. It may go into the record and become a part of the official record.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 449" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 449

36 CLAVERLY HALL, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

January 31, 1937.

DEAR KARL-HEINRICH: I received your letter and the memorandum yesterday; and after going through it again, I handed the memorandum to Parry. I should like you to let me know whether you can use your own name as an editor. I understood you to say so, but I should like to make certain of it.

After I came back here in the middle of the month (I was detained in a hospital in Pittsburgh for influenza), I found the situation here to be very unsatisfactory, so far as the matter of S&S is concerned. No inroad had been made into undergraduates; efforts expended were scattered and unco-ordinated; study-groups were waning both in number and vigor; and so on. Tightening up will follow, at least I shall see to it that all the efforts be made to that end, when and as soon as our memorandum is discussed here. So, as to the situation here, I shall let you know on the next occasion.

The project of compiling "A Guide to Marxian Studies" has been progressing rather falteringly. Harap, the chairman, asked Webbs to take one assignment; but they, as could have been expected, refused. Some of the completed assignments were discussed by the committee in Cambridge last week. Salient contradictions in the original plan came out concretely into relief; such as, the lack of care concerning the personnel, the nature of the guide, etc. Harap explained to me that (1) as to the inadequate choice of personnel, we can mend it by checking and rechecking, and (2) as to the vagueness of the nature of the Guide, we might as well pool all the informations first and later use knife and scissors. I did not raise any problems, because I thought that the memorandum would. Undoubtedly, we shall have a discussion on the matter of the Guide soon. Meanwhile, Harap has repeatedly urged me to hasten whomever I have asked to take the assignment on Political Economy to finish it and send it to Cambridge. This "whomever," as I hope you remember, means you yourself.

Although I trust the truth of Parry's explanation, I feel very much annoyed about my article. I handed in two copies. And now I am told that the only person who read it in New York is Ramsay (and a few others whom Ramsay showed). Both copies are "lost." Since the editors never broach the subject to me unless I do it first, I gather that they are not, according to their editorial policy, very eager to have the article in the magazine at this moment. Although I could not very well emphasize the timeliness of the topic (Laski stressed the necessity of the Marxian critique on the problem in his recent article in *The New Statesman and Nation*) because it concerns my own article, I suggested to Parry that I shall rewrite it again as soon as possible so that it will be in time for the third issue, if the editors want me to. Parry thinks that the editors wish me to do so. While we are tarrying, two more articles have appeared on the subject of economic planning in a socialist society; one by Alan Sweezy in the volume in honor of Taussig (Alan is the elder brother of Paul Sweezy) and another by Darbin in the current issue of *Economic Journal*. Lange's concluding article will appear shortly in the February issue of the *Review of Economic Studies*. (By the way, when you get through with the last copy of R. E. S. which I left with you in Chicago, I should like you to send it back to me. I wish to use it in rewriting my article.)

As to Paul Sweezy's review of von Mises's book on economic planning, Parry does not know precisely why it was left out of the second issue of S&S. I am not quite certain whether the second issue is really very much of an improvement over the first. I haven't read all the articles, though. As to Darrell's article: (1) His exposition of Keynes' ideas, in spite of covering such a wide space, is inadequate in the sense that it does not bring out the salient points into relief and further that it is almost incomprehensible to non-economists. (I have found this out by talking to those who have read the article). (2) Points of agreement between Marx and Keynes which Darrell finds are superficial. In Keynes, the matter of talking in terms of homogeneous labor and of calculating cost by the unit of such homogeneous labor alone is only a technical device suited for his own convenience and is not an essential element. Perhaps the most likely similarity between Keynes and Marx, if at all, is their theory of the rate of interest (distinguished from the rate of profit). (3) Too many running comments of quibbling nature. Often these hide behind them very important questions. (4) Darrell's major criticism thus far (because this is only the first installment) is that the Keynes's method essentially concords with a subjective theory of value. (He calls in the authority of Hicks who only says that Keynes's technique is the technique of Marshall.) Though Keynes resorts to "a fundamental psychological law" and uses a number of quasi-psychological terms, I feel that the weakness of Keynes lies not in "psychologizing" (Darrell) but in inventing those categories which, by taking care of imponderables in a bundle fashion, enable him to render his theoretical formulation precise and to give the appearance of its usability in prediction and control. Before I see the second installment, I could not say, of course, that Darrell has not dealt with the fundamental weakness of Keynes. To my knowledge, Leontief in *Q. J. E.* and Schumpeter in *Journal of American Statistical Assn.* have done more damage on Keynes than Darrell. It is unfortunate that Darrell's review had to come in two installments. Parry tells me that he did not even read the article because it came in too late.

As to Hogben's article: (1) First of all, I must report to you that this article has been received rather favorably by a large number of my university acquaintances around here. (2) I have a serious objection to this article. When Hogben shows concretely the relation between ideology and basic structure, I only ap-

plaud. But when he comes, in the last third of the article, to condemn "the obsessional Germanophilia" and ask for the acceptance of the limitations imposed by a common linguistic culture, I feel he is overanxious to the extent of clouding the element of truth which his message contains. His overanxiousness in this regard goes so far that in the first part of his article he gives the credit of being a pioneer in the labor theory of value to William Petty by quoting a sentence which does not have an intimation of the labor theory of value (cf. p. 142) and then makes alluding remarks here and there to the effect that Anglo-American scientists of the 18th century were already historical materialists (cf. p. 143 11.13-17, p. 146 1.29), and finally attributes erroneously the formalism of Robbins to the scholastic tradition of English universities (p. 144). The upshot is to call the method of dialectic materialism as "a foreign creed" or "a pot of message." One gets the impression as if he were saying that we in England and America have scientists who were the pioneers in the labor theory of value and historical materialism, why should we bother reading Hegel or even Marx! To criticize formula-ism is one thing; to condemn the study of the *method* of dialectics by studying Hegel is another thing. It is not "our social (?) heritage" which we must nurture and develop (in fact, we must revolutionize much of our social heritage), but it is the application of the new *method* (in understanding our heritage and in deriving whatever fruits we may derive) that we must learn and learn it *despite* the bourgeois heritage.

As to the review by Kuznets, I feel that it does not have a place in *Science and Society*. A Marxist review should take its place on those books of the Brookings Institution.

As to the review by Schuman, I feel very sorry that the editors had to cater to those intellectuals who are awed by the name of Schuman, if such was the reason (since I do not see any other reason) of including this review. On the books of Grover Clark also, we can afford to have a Marxist review; and there are more than a few persons who can do it.

I also read Leo Roberts' article. It starts out well with promises attractive enough (cf. p. 169 1.30). But the whole thing is a disappointing muddle.

I am sending you, under a separate cover, the January issue of *The Left News*. You may have seen it. But just in case you haven't. And I enclose here four coupons. Though Americans are not eligible as members, you can get around it by writing to G. C. MacLaulin as is indicated on the coupon. MacLaulin, like Ralph Fox, was killed in a battle near Madrid recently. But his friends are taking care of this agent-job. In the *Left News*, read especially an account "The Groups Month by Month" by the organizer of the local groups, Dr. John Lewis.

As we say in our oriental proverb, we may learn from them though they are "stones from other mountains."

Do take care of your health. And warmest regards to you and Gertrude.

(TSURU)

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Morris has promised to obtain for us the documents from which these copies were made.

Mr. MORRIS. He didn't promise.

Senator JENNER. He said he would attempt to.

Mr. GLOVER. Because the comments Mr. Tsuru made with respect to this first letter are applicable to the other letters.

Mr. SOURWINE. I respectfully suggest that if counsel is going to testify, he be sworn.

Senator JENNER. If you want to confer with your client at any time, permission will be granted, but we want no further interruption.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the witness' attention to the reference to the memorandum in the letter of February 22, 1937, last large paragraph:

This fact itself reveals a shortcoming in my mind. Most concretely, the shortcoming came into light at the time our memorandum was brought down to New York.

Then in the letter of April 9 you write:

I have persistently repeated to Parry that the matter of the memorandum is of immediate and primary importance and that according to my impression their

slow response is partly due to their slipshodness with which they distinguish the party fraction from the editorial board. The memorandum is addressed to the fraction; and it seems to me that it is a breach of discipline for them to have laid it aside for more than 2 months.

You mean it is a breach of Communist Party discipline?

Mr. TSURU. I think that is the implication I gave at that place. But please look at the following sentence where I say, "I have no authority to say anything further on this matter."

Mr. MORRIS. That seems to say there is a limitation in your authority?

Mr. TSURU. I was not a member of the Communist Party although I was aware that the memorandum was to be addressed to the fraction I could not bring the matter into, in the Communist organization personally.

The only thing I could do was to speak to Mr. Parry and I think that is the reason I—

Senator JENNER. Now, Mr. Parry was a Communist.

Mr. TSURU. That is my understanding at the time. If you ask me what I think of him now, I haven't seen him since about 1940 so I cannot testify anything about him since 1940.

Senator JENNER. You don't even know where he is?

Mr. TSURU. I don't even know where he is. So the very fact that I was not a member of the Communist Party made it necessary for me, under the circumstances, to press Parry constantly on the matter, and I wrote to Miss Kyle that I have no authority to say anything further in this matter.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, I offer you, and you have seen it overnight, have you not, a document which purports to be a memorandum to the editors of Science and Society?

Mr. TSURU. To the editors; yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now you have had a chance to look at that; have you not?

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And this is the memorandum to which you refer in this last letter that I have read?

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And this is the memorandum that you said was addressed to the party fraction?

Mr. TSURU. Exactly.

Mr. MORRIS. You were one of the three people who signed this?

Mr. TSURU. Yes; but if I may, I should like to explain.

Mr. MORRIS. It bears the signature, Senator, of Constance Kyle, Department of Psychiatry, University of Chicago; Karl Niebyl, Department of Economics, Carleton College, and Alfred Z. Lowe. Yesterday you remember that the witness told us he used the name Alfred Z. Lowe?

Senator JENNER. In other words, you signed this document as Alfred Z. Lowe?

Mr. TSURU. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. And I might say, subpoenas have been issued for the others.

Senator JENNER. This memorandum will go into the record and become a part of the official record of this committee.

(The document referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 450," and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 450

EDITORS OF S. AND S. (SCIENCE AND SOCIETY)

After the distribution of the first issue of S. and S. the undersigned feel it necessary to review the work done and the methods employed with special reference to the middle west.

We are informed indirectly that the Middle West has been showing relatively better response to the magazine in subscription as well as in study groups than in other by no means less important parts of the country. Before we critically evaluate the results of our work as well as the work in general, we would like to give a clear conception about the method which we employed along with the basic considerations upon which we arrived at the actual determination of this method.

It is our opinion that ss did not appear accidentally at this particular time. The fact that a magazine of the similar nature has appeared in the last forty years in Germany, Russia, Switzerland, and Japan while not in the Anglo-Saxon countries especially not in the US seems to us to reflect a basically uneven development the recognition of which is fundamental to our determination of the method which we have to employ in regard to SS in the US. According to the analysis of the Seventh world congress, capitalism has entered its crisis as such. For the US this meant that the very basis of the position of the intellectual—while we are *not* of the opinion that SS is only or even primarily directed to the intellectuals, a point which will be clarified later on, we think that it is best to develop our analysis *from* that specific point in the class struggle where SS originated, the intellectual—the economic basis for the opportunism and for the lack of their being forced to develop class consciousness in the form of revolutionary theory has withered away and that this necessity in many different forms was becoming apparent. Reviewed in this way, SS is not only a manifestation of the grown contradictions in the American capitalist society but represents in itself an active force and an important and indispensable weapon within the struggle of these contradictions.

More concretely, this means that SS as a manifestation of this stage of the contradictions is to be not only a platform for increasingly class-conscious intellectuals but as an active force is also to be used to drive the members of those middle-class strata whose very basis in these days is for the first time being generally shattered towards such an analysis as put forward in SS. In this way we arrive at an exactly contrary result to that which the editors of SS seem to have arrived at by advocating a conscious neglect of study groups.

PART ONE

Regarding the foregoing as an introduction, we shall review concretely this problem of study groups. The opinion of the editors as communicated to us indirectly (and this very fact is in itself a high indictment of the policy of the editors to neglect practically the whole of the middle west—we have received no communications outside of a few purely business matters which in themselves were either too late or not to the point), we understand to be that no initiative shall be taken by the editors of SS to encourage the formation of study groups, although when they already exist the editors are willing to give whatever assistance those study groups may wish to receive. In the light of the foregoing, this seems to us to be a declaration of bankruptcy. Again according to indirect communication, three main reasons are given for your stand (and, if this is not correct, we should very much like to be corrected, as we generally would appreciate very much to be regularly informed of the policy formulated by the editorial board. In fact, we feel that it would not be asking too much for the friends in the Middle West to be consulted on such matters).

(1) "Fear of setting up factional opposition between Stalinists and Trotzkites." We are unable to comprehend this point. We would appreciate further elucidation on this point.

(2) It has been maintained by some members of the editorial board that SS is not a political organization. Right! But whoever has maintained that SS was in itself to be conceived of as a political *organization*? We have outlined the general situation of today above. In this situation, the question of political organization does not confront all parts of middle classes with an equal imme-

diacy. It is here that SS has to fulfill one of its most important functions (may we remind ourselves at this point that we are speaking about the function of SS in connection with the position of the intellectuals and not in many other respects in which it is most certainly not of no small importance, as is indicated by the role played by Unter dem Banner des Marxismus for the theoretical clarification *within* the party) to serve as an effective weapon against conflicting and contradictory bourgeois theories and offering at the same time to these groups a basis through which *political organization* of these groups (e.g., the League against W. and F., Teachers' and other professional unions, C. P.) will only be possible. Again more concretely, it is not enough to sell the magazine and to feel self-satisfied with the growing sub. list which is pouring in because of the general situation and in spite of ourselves. But we have to be active at exactly those weak links of bourgeois intelligentsia where SS is read; active in the sense that:

1. we have to deepen or even first to prepare the ground for an understanding of the Marxist content of the magazine. Such a necessity is abundantly clear from the last issue. (We specifically refer to the articles by McGill, Struik, and Brameld.)

2. we help these people already responsive to the magazine to find the "political" contents of the magazine.

3. we make a conscious effort of extending this field of responsiveness by organizing study groups around specific scientific fields, for instance, modern problems in physics, or relation of biology to political science, or the function of law and dictatorship, etc., etc., in each case bearing in mind that our function is to expose the inherent contradictions in the bourgeois approach and to lead the members of the study groups to realize the only correct approach: the approach of dialectic materialism. The initiating spark for such study groups by no means *has* to be SS, but the magazine will prove to be an indispensable tool for the operation of such study groups after once they are formed.

4. it is obvious that these study groups (we are speaking of only those types mentioned under 1, 2, and 3) will be helped materially by some kind of loose central organization—the editorial board could perhaps perform this function—by (a) stimulating particular study groups, and (b) by exchanging valuable results between different study groups as regards methods employed, fields discussed, and results obtained.

In our opinion this does not infringe in any way the function performed by Workers' Schools. For the following reasons:

1. As far as intellectuals are concerned, their attending of classes in Workers' Schools presupposes a definite decision on their part; not only many of them at the moment are not willing to make such a decision due to lack of conviction, but many external circumstances impose the degree of precaution which they most certainly are not willing to forego *before* having attended a study group. Furthermore, there are a number of people whose right to precaution under the circumstances given would certainly not be denied.

2. Study groups are not to be perceived as regular courses beginning with the reading of Manifesto and ending with the application of the Third Volume of Capital to their specific fields. Such a course would certainly belong to Workers' Schools. Positive contents of such study groups have been outlined above.

3. There should be no reason why SS study groups could not be organized within the framework of Workers' Schools as actually done in the W. S. here in Chicago. Such a group would serve a similar function as those groups mentioned before only for slightly more developed intellectuals who do not object to going to a W. S. but might find it difficult to start their Marxist education on an elementary basis. Secondly, there are those within such a group who are far more easily approached via their own fields. The problem we have to keep in mind, with intellectuals defined as middle-class people suffering to a higher degree from ideologies, is always to make them conscious of the ideological nature of their thought and to involve them by means of this process in political action. If these intellectuals would be induced to join and come into W. S. (which in itself is highly improbable), then there would be a danger that because of the above-mentioned ideological nature of persons concerned the immediate teaching of the principles of Marxism to them would tend to strengthen their ideologies although changing forms (the elevation of the Marxist concept of revolution into a theory

of revolution, as for instance Trotzkism). That danger would be offset by the existence of SS study groups within the framework of Workers' Schools. If these considerations prove the necessity of SS study groups in our struggle for the winning over of the intellectuals, then this by no means exhausts the function of SS as a political weapon.

PART TWO

In a letter by Stalin to the editors of the central organ of the YCL of the Soviet Union (unfortunately, we do not have material with us to check), several years ago, Stalin stressed the great importance of the practical work performed in the Soviet Union since the revolution as something to be extremely proud of. But he said that little had been done for the struggle on the theoretical front. And this established one of the weakest points in the development of Soviet Union. He then stressed the responsibility of the Party and urged the concentration on this point. We think that a lesson could be taken from this letter to our own situation.

We feel it our duty to ask ourselves the question: what work has been done in analyzing the present complex situation in this country? Most certainly the analysis of the Seventh World Congress has given the basis for the analysis which was concretized and applied to the US in the Ninth convention. These analyses, however, could stress because of their very nature only the changes in the basic structure as well as certain specific aspects of it. The manifestations of these changes in, for instance, bourgeois economic theory, philosophy, natural sciences, etc., still wait for appropriate analyses and, even more, we are still waiting (and the fact that we are waiting is in itself an indictment) for an adequate expression of these changes in Marxist theoretical terms. The general attempt made in this direction is an analysis by Varga which should perform for us the same function as the Seventh World Congress to the Ninth Party Convention. The only concretization, however, which has as yet appeared (besides the attempt by a capitalist economist like Bonn) is the one by Corey of which we have as yet not even published an adequate critique. Comrade Bittelman's critique in the Communist is extremely valuable and necessary, but it treats only one aspect of the book and does not develop in positive terms our analysis of the total situation. Unter dem Banner des Marxismus was used in Germany by no means only by those groups described in Part One, but did become an indispensable weapon in many shop and street units. The frequent objection against an expressed desire to see SS function in the similar way is that our working-class comrades would not understand and even more would not be interested in the problems dealt with in SS. May we suggest that such an attitude exhibits an unwarranted snobbishness on the part of some intellectual comrades who conclude from the fact that the highbrow terminology is not understood that the workers are not interested in the subject matter. However, not only the function of U. d. B. d. M. in Germany or earlier Iskra in Russia, but the very fact that Lenin found it necessary to devote many months of study to write a volume on philosophy "Empirio-criticism" and the subsequent extraordinarily wide circulation of this book among the working class seem to us to prove conclusively that there is something wrong with *us* and not with the *subject matter*. The conclusion to be drawn from above seems to us to be twofold: first, that the editors have to keep definitely this function of SS in mind, and, secondly, that our conscious effort should not go only in the direction as outlined in the Part One but also to use SS in the direct party work as outlined in the Part Two.

PART THREE

In this following part we would like to give an account of some major developments in Chicago area as to the sub. and contributors drive and the SS study groups as far as it elucidates important problems in connection with which we would like to make in part four some concrete suggestions.

A. When late last summer the appearance of SS was announced, the undersigned got together and on the basis of considerations similar to those outlined above we made the following plan:

We had access to the student groups at universities; we had a very few contacts with the faculty; in the city we had a contact with the social worker groups and teachers' organizations. Our first objective was to have one reliable agent for each one of these groups and one central agent to coordinate the work of those agents and to maintain the contact with Cambridge and New York. The function

of these agents was definitely determined. With the help of propaganda material, they had to cover those groups of which they were chosen as representatives for sub. as well as contributions, having at the same time in mind the extension of those groups to which they already had access as well as the forming of study groups among those who showed more than ordinary interest in the objective of the magazine. It might be emphasized at this point that this plan was by no means a purely organizational application of a theoretically perceived outline, but that many and lengthy discussions were held, not only with the agents, but with other people as well in order to make as clear as possible that the function was not purely that of a sub. agent but in itself a fight on the theoretical front.

As a further device for distribution, we first contacted the three Chicago Workers bookstores and discussed with them on the sale of this magazine and made arrangements for the prominent display of posters and propaganda materials. Further arrangements were made to use the regular channels of distribution of Marxian literatures to the bourgeois bookstores. Direct contact was established with the managers of the two bourgeois bookstores on the U. of C. campus. Although they agreed to contact with N. Y. directly, we supplied several copies to meet the immediate demand. In addition to this regular method of distribution, one hundred copies of the first issue were obtained by the central agent and distributed to those agents and those interested persons who before the actual appearance of the first issue already started the sub. drive and now followed up their contacts with actual copies.

If these were the methods which we had planned, the following are the difficulties which we have encountered. As far as the difficulties with the distribution of the magazine were concerned, the outstanding one was response resulting (a) from the nature of the magazine, and (b) from the character of the first issue. The former, being of general nature, has been dealt with above and was to be expected, with one exception: the reception of the magazine among certain white collar sections of the party. It necessitated considerable—to convince the comrades in the white-collar faction of the necessity of spending time and energy for the distribution and utilization of SS as a political weapon. Arguments used by us were those used in the Parts One and Two, with the result that the objection has been largely overcome. As to the latter (b), objections of varied types have been encountered:

(1) to take typical objection raised by people who more or less came for the first time into contact with the Marxian scientific literature, we have encountered the criticism that the articles seem to approach the problem with an *a priori* thesis and manipulate the subject matter to fit this *a priori* thesis. Although this common bourgeois objection has been met by Marx in his explanation of his method when dealing with his critics in the postscript to the second edition of Capital, we still might profitably raise the question whether the actual methods used in the articles of the first issue are Maxian dialectics, or whether they are not, as it seems to us, a mechanical use of dialethic terms. (Cf., somewhat classical example of Struik's article.) This is not the place to go into specific criticisms of different articles.

(2) The second objection which has been brought to our attention is the lack of an observable editorial policy in the sense that not sufficient attention has been paid to the weighing of relative importance of different topics which might be treated. We assume, however, that editors were aware that such objection might be raised, the objection traceable to difficulties largely inherent in the situation.

If we regard these as outstanding examples of difficulties which we encountered, discounting those difficulties which of course arise constantly because of the very nature of the magazine with which we dealt above, there still remains the possibility of a difficulty arising out of the appearance of The Marxist Quarterly. The tactics employed by the MQ of avoiding any clear-cut distinction between the two magazines seems to indicate to us a difficulty as well as a hope. A difficulty in making clear the distinction at this moment to our readers. A hope because we think that the absence of a clear Trotzkyite line will only put the actual burden of justifying the existence of two journals upon those who elsewhere justify the existence by being an opposition to us. Secondly, with the absence of a clear editorial policy of either being Lovestoneites or Trotzkyites, it tends to bring the opposing forces within this group to so much the more rapid disruptive conflict.

Let us consider now some of the shortcomings on our own part, both in general and specifically in Chicago.

First, we in Chicago failed to anticipate the actual extent of the demand for the magazine. Concretely this was seen in (a) our failure to realize the actual

possibilities as quickly as we might have; (b) our failure to utilize our sympathizers to satisfy this active demand; and (c) the underestimation of workers bookshops in ordering their stocks.

Furthermore we did not succeed always in preparing our agents to the extent we had planned about the promotion of SS not only as a source of information but also as a political weapon.

We did not succeed as intended to collect donations for SS to an adequate extent. The reason for that, besides the lack of the realization of its necessity, is that the groups we contacted first were professionals whose resources were quite heavily drawn upon by various professional organizations or students, and it is only now that we, especially study groups, begin to penetrate into groups which might be effectively used for this purpose.

As to the question of contributions to the magazine, we are slowly beginning to see the first results of our strenuous advocating of the necessity for contributions among the sympathizers of SS; this, however, does not mean that printable articles will be available in the near future. But the foundation seems to be laid. As regards contributions by recognized scientists, we have not yet succeeded in obtaining any. Certain connections have been made, for instance in the U. of Minnesota, but it will take some more time before common platform will be reached to such people which will make contributions valuable to us. Here again, SS study groups have proved indispensable. As communicated to you in the earlier date, many foreign possible contributors have been contacted. Most of them will have contacted you directly. As far as we, the undersigned, are concerned, (1) Lowe has written an article on economics which has not yet been returned to him since the beginning of August. In view of the timeliness of the article, we consider it very unfortunate that such negligence has occurred;

(2) K. H. N. intended and still intends to write an article on the qualitative changes which have taken place in the trade-union structure since the great depression. Although the article has not been written because of the too heavy teaching role during the last semester, N. has never heard from the editors whether such an article is actually in line with their policy or not. As regards the book review, N. had been asked by Sam Sillen whether he would be willing to write a review of Manheim's Ideology and Utopia, and consented, but never received a copy of the book. As yet, N. has not been asked to write any other review, although he has made several suggestions especially in the direction of treating economic subjects more extensively.

In regard to the general shortcomings, the last point made emphasizes already the lack of adequate communication between the middle west and the editors. N. has, for instance, written several letters to New York as well as to Cambridge; and except for the promises for the future, he has never received an adequate reply. The same is true as to the technical organization. As a good example might serve the letter of the central distributing agency for the Workers bookstore to N. Y. requesting information about the discount and other business matters. But an answer was not received before the first issue came out. Instead they received 150 copies with no information as to the terms on which they were to handle. This was particularly serious as they had already planned to order 500 copies of the first issue upon receipt of the answer to their letter on business details. These examples could be multiplied. N. gave the addresses of several important contacts at one time, and at another time he sent subscriptions for several people and ordered several copies for himself. He never received an answer nor copies. Aside from these particular instances, the matter of general organization and planning comes up. When we had appointed Miss K. as the central agent in Chicago area, we had suggested that she should make reports of her work to the editors. Lowe whom we had asked to arrange for this got into contact with the managing editor but no provision was made. In consequence, no report was made. According to our information, the same holds true for the relation between Madison, Wis., and NY. This is the matter definitely to be remedied, and as it seems to us, not only for the Middle West but for all places where SS is being distributed.

When N. was in NY last summer, he talked with McGill about several points, among them the necessity for translations of classical writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and others. Concrete suggestions were made. Thus, Natur and Dialektik, parts of Deutsche Ideologie, of Theorien über den Mehrwert, etc. Not only did nothing come out of it, but The Marxist Quarterly performed this task which we neglected.

We understand that it is the policy of the editors not to review any foreign books. We sincerely hope that this is misunderstanding. Although due space

should be allotted to American publications, the very distinction between books which appeared outside of US and those within the present boundaries of US seems to us a fallacious one. To us, there seems to be only one distinction possible; that of relevant, less relevant, and irrelevant books, relevancy being determined by the problems which we as Marxists face in a specific situation, this in turn to be evaluated in the editorial policy.

B. Study groups:

The general situation and our policy germane thereto have been described above. In accordance with that policy, we allotted our forces to penetrate into the following channels:

Marxism as a science was of course studied at several points outside the Workers School before SS appeared. During the last year, students at the University had tried to organize Marxist Study Clubs sponsored by YCL. But this did not succeed very well because the clubs were regarded primarily as recruiting fields for YCL. When SS appeared, it was possible to use it as a means to revive the interest in the study of Marxism. We were fortunate enough to find a responsible person to devote more or less his whole time to this purpose. In close contact with the central agent, he went out to find responsible persons in the different departments on the campus who in turn would be able to mobilize all the potential interests in Marxism in these specific departments. In this way, we reached far beyond the previous scope of the Marxist study clubs. And by attacking the problem on the ground of their special field of interest, we succeeded in involving persons who heretofore had not been cognizant of the bearing which the Marxian analysis has on their accustomed ways of and materials for thinking. It has been possible already to involve some of those persons in direct action which after all is the major objective. Such groups are functioning or ready to function in economics, social sciences, humanities, and physics.

In the faculty of U. of C. we find a replica of the general situation outlined in the previous parts: that is, the deepening schism or the far greater preparedness to study Marxism on the one side and reaction on the other. The first actual study group among the faculty has been established and will begin its works in the coming week.

In Northwestern U., the situation is somewhat different. Situated in the most reactionary suburb of Chicago, a stronghold of the Liberty League, with a strong church background of the University itself, the faculty tends to be still more conservative than the one of Chicago University. The few contacts we had in the faculty of Northwestern, therefore, we brought together with another independent group of teachers and other intellectuals in that neighborhood, who had formed already a study circle for which they employed regularly a teacher from the Workers School.

Still another difficulty was that we were able to contact the faculty only from the outside as we had no one trustworthy and capable enough on the campus to act as a leader. The purpose and meaning of SS was then fully discussed with the already established group and they have been using the magazine effectively in their group. On the Northwestern Down Town Campus (Med. School, Law School, etc.) we have as yet only one person who is distributing the Magazine and looking for other persons interested in our aims with the view of getting subs as well as forming a study group before long.

The other colleges and universities in Chicago have not yet been covered with such a concentrated effort. This is mainly due to the fact that we had insufficient direct contacts with them, and we might add here that we would appreciate if you would communicate to us any addresses of persons who might serve such a purpose. However, this does not mean that nothing was done in that direction. The party faction of the teachers, with whom we had long and thorough discussions, had been largely responsible for the above-mentioned study group. Besides that they had established another Marxist study group in the city comprised of about thirty-five members also under the direction of a teacher from the workers school. Into this latter study group S. and S. has been introduced and is being used. Beyond that, however, the faction works as an agent for us and we hope that it will soon be possible to have more study groups and extend the field of influence of SS.

Similarly we proceeded with the social workers. The faction was here to our starting point, through which we brought S & S into the work of the units as well as contacted through them outside persons. One S & S study group under the leadership of two able comrades was formed here and has been meeting weekly since September. It is with this group that we gained our

most valuable experience. We found that such SS study circles must be very carefully organized on an extremely flexible basis. The group which came together here was of a relatively heterogeneous character. We found that several members of the group were soon able to attend directly the courses in the workers school, a fact which was not soon enough realized but meanwhile remedied. Similarly we found that topics of too general or "fundamental" a nature tended to weaken the interest of certain members, nothing to say about the fact that they tended to repeat only what more effectively could have been done by the workers' school. In positive terms, this is being remedied by dividing the group as far as possible into definite fields of professional interest or, where this is not possible, by clearly stating the different fields in advance, pointing out the problems involved and taking up one field after the other.

As a last instance of forming SS study groups we would like to discuss briefly the formation of such a group within the framework of the workers' school. Our general ideas about this have been given above. The course which is officially announced in the bulletin of the workers' school was thoroughly discussed with the friend who is going to lead it. The participants consist of psychiatrists, physiologists, a psychologist, a dentist, lawyers, a biologist, a journalist, an artist, and a philosopher (we are well aware of the fact that these seem to be strange bedfellows). It is obvious that, to say the least, such a heterogeneous group offers very difficult problems. As these people, however, by consenting to come to the workers' school, had already made the definite decision which that implies, and as we had to find a common working basis, we suggested that they should start with a more fundamental though general discussion on dialectics based perhaps on the short article by Bukharin in Marxism and Modern Thought. To support this, we compiled an outside reading list. This discussion was to go over about five to six evenings; after this the main fields of interest were to be selected and if possible the members were to be divided into such interest groups with the objective of studying such fields more specifically; as for instance, biology and Marxian method, the science of law of Marxism, etc. In order to avoid too vague a treatment, specific concrete problems within those fields were formulated and reading lists for each of the fields compiled. As the members of this group consist of people who speak different languages, the untranslated writings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, as well as modern Russian publications were included. The leader of the group is so optimistic as to hope that they will get several papers written which he intends to collect and make available not only to other study groups here but to send to you with the hope that other groups might do the same; and that material thus collected might be made mutually available through you.

In Minneapolis we got a foothold at the University of Minnesota where a group of a few economic historians, political scientists, and a philosopher was meeting with N. fairly regularly. The discussion revolved mainly around an interpretation of history coupled, of course, with an understanding of present events. Fairly good headway has been made. There is a possibility that the group will have to be reorganized because two of the members will go to Washington, DC, after Christmas.

We have worked in close contact with Madison, Wisconsin, and N. was there only a few weeks ago and found that the friend in charge of S&S there, though extremely capable, encounters certain difficulties inherent in the situation in Madison. We suggest, however, that you might get directly in touch with Mr. John Cookson, 701 West Johnson Street, c/o Herman Ramras, Madison, Wisconsin.

We conclude by saying that we would appreciate your reactions to this formulation of our experience in regard to study groups and that we would like to hear from you equally elaborately about the experiences in this respect in other places.

PART FOUR

Concrete suggestions

1. Resulting from the consideration put forth in the above memorandum, we propose that the editorial policy should exhibit a conscious effort to make the magazine into a tool of our present-day struggle on the theoretical front rather than an encyclopaedic compendium of various learned treatments of scientific problems. This implies that the articles to be printed shall be selected from a point of view determined by an analysis of the problems confronting us at that moment.

2. Resulting from the criticisms given in the memorandum on the editorial policy concerning study groups, we propose a reconsideration of this policy

and a change in the direction which experiences in the Middle West point to.

3. As mentioned before, we propose that serious consideration should be given to the translation of outstanding basic writings of Marxist leaders.

4. In regard to the book review section of the magazine, we propose reconsideration of the editorial policy, the only criterion possible to be the relevancy of the books under consideration, this relevancy in turn being determined by the same analysis which determines the selection of articles as outlined under 1.

5. We feel strongly that the Mid-West and if possible the Far West should be actively represented on the editorial board. The desirability of this has been acknowledged frequently for many reasons:

- (a) Avoidance of the top-heaviness of the East
- (b) The necessity of a conscious building of leadership as opposed to a reliance on spontaneity—c. f., Lenin What's To Be Done
- (c) The necessity for the recognition of the actual potentialities for use of S. & S. as a political weapon also west of the Alleghenys
- (d) The desirability of a distribution of duties over as large an area as possible
- (e) The necessity of arriving at an adequate analysis of the situation in order to determine the editorial policy of the magazine seems to us to demand an adequate representation of as many districts as possible on the editorial board. As far as the representation of the Mid-West is concerned, friend Lowe will personally make concrete suggestions.

6. We propose a reconsideration of our understanding of the general function of an agent. Practically, we propose dismissal of the concept of agents as mere subscription agents. The drive for subscriptions cannot and should not be separated from the agents' political and educational function.

Special attention should be given to the problem of getting more of such agents and of extending the territory covered with the help of such agents.

7. "A guide to Marxist Studies." Friend Lowe communicated to us the outline for the proposed guide to Marxist studies. May we express our surprise that no one in the Mid-West ever heard of this enterprise before it was launched. In the outline before us there seem to us to be several contradictions. It is stated that "an exhaustive Marxist bibliography for intensive research in specialized fields would prove extremely useful," but it is not even indicated why such a bibliography could not be compiled and why only an introductory guide is attempted to be compiled. We infer that the difficulty for an exhaustive Marxist bibliography lies in the fact that such an overwhelming part of the Marxist literature has not yet been translated. This, however, seems to us to be not necessarily a valid objection, especially if we confront the attempted bibliography with the professed, and under the heading "Audience," enumerated aims.

It seems to us meaningless to say that the guide should be neither "exhaustive" nor "for the advanced student as such" when we continue the sentence that it is intended "for the ordinary intelligent student of socialism." We cannot quite understand what kind of students the composer of this outline had in mind when he speaks about the use of such an outline for "college courses which bear on the various aspects of socialism"; we understand still less when he speaks about "the student already possessing some knowledge of socialism who wishes to make a study of fields not yet investigated"; and we do not understand at all the snobbishness with which he speaks about the "workers who wish to deepen their knowledge of socialism."

Needless to say, there is a flagrant contradiction between the initial modesty as regards the scope of the outline and the actually proposed contents as enumerated on the next page. Under the heading "Scope," it is written that "the projected guide will serve to indicate the *best exposition of Marxism and its implications for the special branches of knowledge.*" If this is to indicate the red thread which is supposed to run through the outline, we fail entirely and absolutely to see where the composer is to get an "estimated number of two hundred items" of the "bare minimum of basic works, specifically Marxist works" of the history of the United States. If such a thing would be possible, we would see still less how this red thread could be carried out under the heading "Political Theory." The remarks attached to this heading indicate already that the composer of this table of contents thought it impossible to collect sufficient Marxist studies in the English language in this field when he speaks about "intimations of socialist theory in American political theory." In this way every one of the different paragraphs of the table of contents could be analyzed; the result would remain the same.

As the outline in the proposed form seems to us for these reasons not only not to serve the purpose put forward but to add positively to the undoubtedly existing confusion, and

As on the other side we are convinced with you that a *bibliographical guide to studies of Marxism* is highly desirable and necessary,

We propose that:

(a) An exhaustive bibliography should be compiled of all *Marxist* literatures, as far as we have knowledge of it, regardless in which language it appeared.

(b) This bibliography should be compiled, of course, under certain headings. However, we propose that in the enumeration of these headings due modesty should be applied.

(c) A very valuable bibliography up to 1925 or '26 has been compiled and published in the first volume of the Marx-Engels Archiv. If the bibliography would be brought up to date, it would be augmented by a selection of representative Russian publications (extremely necessary!) and if then this bibliography would be furnished with an introduction and the necessary elucidations of the enumerated items as well, we think that such a work would not only be extremely useful but fill a gap which has been felt for a long time.

(d) In order to make this bibliography also useful and accessible for people who are mainly interested in the more basic and fundamental Marxist works we propose that such works should be printed in bold face.

(e) As regards this reference to the treatment of the history of US, we do not think that bourgeois works "easily adapted to Marxists use" should be included especially if their number is estimated somewhere around two hundred. Bibliographies of the US history are easily available in every bourgeois library. It does not need, we hope, to be emphasized that such a principle is not to be used with *absolute* rigidity. Works like that of *Charles Beard*, if given adequate annotations, may very well serve our purpose.

(f) Especial care should be given to the selection as to the persons who are to be entrusted with the compilation of the different parts of this bibl. We cannot see for instance that Laski would be able to give an adequate bibl. of the Marxist interpretation of law. The man who in our opinion should come in this connection into our mind would be Pashkhanis of the Red Academy.

However, if there should be, because of a lack of forces available, choice to be made between such a bibliography and translations of basic Marxist works into English, we strongly advocate that the latter be given preference. We feel that the need for the translation cannot be emphasized too much.

8. It would go definitely too far to give within the framework of this memorandum an exhaustive criticism of all the articles of the first issue. We shall content ourselves with enumerating a few:

(a) As regards McGill's article, we understand that the article in the first issue is only the first installment. This however is nowhere indicated. We therefore take the article as a whole. The critical analysis of logical positivism as given by McGill seems to us to be a mere critique within the framework of this bourgeois philosophical system, to which Marxian terms are only attached. In other words, in our opinion no visible attempt is made to understand logical positivism as an outgrowth of the specific historical situation of today and to determine its specific place in the situation. The omission of this analysis is clearly reflected in the results attained at the end of the article. It is stated there that logical positivism "is not at present . . . a reactionary philosophy," and this conclusion is proved by the stand the logical positivists took at the international congress at Prague. Surprisingly enough, a few lines later, this position is explained by the observation "that the students of logical positivism at the universities of Vienna, Prague, Warsaw, etc., are typically poor and without prospect, and while their disinterested (! ! ! K. H. N.) devotion to the most abstract and impractical studies resembles somewhat the zeal of chess players, and also expresses surreptitiously a revolt against the pompous idealism of the tyrannies which surround and threaten them, since, in terms of their analysis, this idealism is literally nonsense." Although this is quoted from Earnest Nagel, McGill arrives at the conclusion that "log. pos. is thus a literary weapon against the favorite philosophies of the fascists." We do not agree with the deduction given. The fact that the class situation of the student in Vienna, etc. forces them to stand against fascism does not elevate log. pos. into a weapon against fascism. Furthermore, the fact that there are contradictions and even violent ones between different philosophies does not make the one whose believers because of a specific class situation are forced temporarily to take a stand against fascism into a weapon against fascism. On the contrary, we would like to sug-

gest that such a philosophy, although involved in such a struggle which reminds us very much of the description of the fratricidal behavior of the capitalists in the first volume of Capital, must serve in the end for its believers as an actual veil against the recognition of their class situation which alone would enable them to fight fascism effectively. This is by no means an advocacy of the leftist deviation as we most heartily would agree to a united front, though temporary, with the logical positivists on specific issues. The patting of logical positivists on the back (page 79, beginning of last paragraph) is not only superfluous. No, their experimentalism is not "even acceptable if it had not cut away the material basis of experiment" because the former is not Logical Positivism without the latter. And thus the argument could be carried on. To conclude, Logical Positivism seems to us to be as much the twin brother of Pareto and similar philosophers as this was true for the semi-revolutionary phraseology of Braunthal and the other apologists of the social democracy in Germany which Stalin so adequately characterized as twin brothers of capitalism. We cannot see the validity of a reasoning that "if history and economic considerations are allowed their proper place, this trend . . . will cumulate in dialectic materialism." "If" seems to indicate that we have forgotten the class roots and resulting from that, the functions of such ideology.

(b) As regards the Struik article. We understand by dialectics a mode of behavior and not a pattern conveniently attached to phenomena which on the surface resemble dialectic process. Although Struik brings out in his article many interesting facts, he seems to us to be guilty of the fallacy mentioned of applying dialectics like a pattern to these facts. He fails to develop or at least to indicate the development of those basic processes of which mathematics was a product and upon which mathematics reacted. It seems to us a lack of dialectical analysis of ideology if we read on page 84 that "the necessity of operating with large numbers leads to a pride in workmanship, to the development of a craft which finds pleasure in computing for computing's sake, in looking for impractical problems to test the power of the method," when such an observation leads to a conclusion "that without this pride in men like Van Cedlen * * * we never should have had the practical invention of logarithms." We fail to understand therefore of course why such an invention as an "interaction * * * between social necessity to get results and the love of science for science's sake" is exhibiting "dialectics or reality, a simple illustration of the unity of opposites." Not only that there does not seem to us to be any dialectic relationship but a mere seeing of ghosts, but the term itself in its novelty seems to ask for clarifying explanation. This concept of the pride of workmanship is repeatedly used till it is finally given the form of the active and direct cause to the birth of analytical geometry (Cf. 85). The method employed by Struik and criticized here becomes definitely obvious when on Page 88 under the pretense of historical analysis he is describing (as distinguished from analyzing) the tendency toward abstraction by mere assertions (Cf. the first half of Page 88). Or if he informs us on p. 92 that "Feudal society did not use exact science much." Of course, it couldn't as exact science was just in the foetal stage.

It would lead too far to investigate here the validity of such a concept as "social causality," but we might only mention that the use of the word "therefore" in the last line of the third paragraph on page 89 by no means disposes of our criticism.

With this method applied, the definition of "genius" as always implying "an element of the irrational, the unexplainable" does not come as a surprise, nor of course the further deduction that "the history of a science which depends so much on the role of genius seems also to have elements of the irrational and the unexplainable." The absurdity of these remarks is not covered up by the mistranslation of Engels in the following sentence in which Struik makes it appear as if by "average shape" he meant the averaging of the special forms affected by genius by the means of a mass action. "Average shape," however, means here socially determined shape in the same way that "Durchschnittsarbeit" is used by Marx as socially determined labor (Das Kapital, Bd. I. S. 49 Adoratzky edition). We might mention at this place that in the following quotation from the Engels correspondence the second half of the third from the last line seems to be a mistranslation although we are at the moment unable to check it. Further, on page 94, the first sentence in the second paragraph only seems to make sense if an "it is" is inserted between "that" and "commodity-fetishism" in the second line. On page 91, the quotation on the head of the page, the German word "Betriebes" is put after the word "cultivation," but this is never a translation of the word "Betrieb." The best possible translation which occurs to our mind at present is "institution.").

Finally, and perhaps most clearly, we see the Struik's method in the statement that "the transition in mentality (i. e., the tendency to think far more in abstraction is reflected in the economic field in the replacement of use value by exchange value." (88) First of all, this transition is not reflected in any replacement in the economic field, but if at all, it is vice versa. But beyond this fundamental misconception, what actually takes place in the economic sphere is by no means the replacement of use value by exchange value, but on the contrary, a dialectic growth of a form which contains both use value and exchange value as opposites.

(c) Communications on Jaensch and Comte seem to us to be valuable information in an appropriate form.

9. We have not as yet seen The Marxist Quarterly personally, but we have received from different sympathizers who had occasion to see it one uniform comment: the attractiveness of the format. We should like to call your attention to this fact.

We would be glad if this memorandum could serve as a profitable basis for discussions, and we would appreciate very much the communication of your reactions.

CONSTANCE KYLE,

Department of Psychiatry of the University of Illinois.

KARL H. NIEBYL,

Department of Economics, Carleton College.

ALFRED Z. LOWE.

CARLETON COLLEGE, NORTHFIELD, MINNESOTA,

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,

Jan. 25, 37.

SHIGETO TSURU,

63, Claverly Hall, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR SHIGETO: I am sorry about the delay the memorandum suffered—let's hope that it is still in time. There are a number of things I would formulate today somewhat differently, but I think it's better we don't begin with any rewriting but wait for the response we get.

I just got the second issue. It looks much better although I haven't had time to read it.

Sam S. just wrote me that I should review Strachey's new book which I think I will do as soon as I will have the copy.

Have you heard anything about your article? Sweezey's remarks I couldn't find in the new issue and Sillen wrote me from NY that he didn't know anything about them.

Do write me what you think about the Keynes article. I will do the same as soon as I have read it.

I won't be able to get to Chicago this week as planned as I am over my neck in work. Next Monday I have to begin teach two new courses for which I haven't prepared as yet anything. I talked to Conny several times on the phone and had several letters, the work seems to go along there nicely, although with the usual birth-paines.

I do hope you are well!

Very cordially,

K (KARL HEINRICH NIEBYL).

Senator JENNER. Do you want to comment?

Mr. TSURU. I want to make clear the part I played in drafting this memorandum.

Senator JENNER. All right.

Mr. TSURU. The memorandum was drafted, I think, in the course of the—toward the end of January 1937, from the end of December 1936 toward the end of January 1937. I was in Chicago for a brief period in the early part of the drafting, and discussed a number of questions contained in the memorandum with two other persons whose names appear there. I tried to refresh my memory yesterday, after receiving this copy, what particular part I was especially instrumental in bringing about. And I am very sorry I cannot recall any particular point, but the general observation I should like to make is that

it is my understanding that Mr. Niebyl had a major role in play in drafting this memorandum, as is clear from the fact that I left Chicago very early in January of 1937, and the memorandum was completed only toward the end of January and sent to me by mail. And furthermore, internal evidence is—

Senator JENNER. Did you go to Chicago to collaborate on this particular memorandum?

Mr. TSURU. The reason I went to Chicago was not simply one, but I knew I was going to Chicago. So I spoke with Mr. Parry, now I don't quite remember but I must have spoken to Mr. Parry before I went to Chicago, and discussed a number of problems related to Science and Society and went to Chicago. But the major reason I went to Chicago was to accompany Prof. and Mrs. Kei Shibata, who had just lost their only son and were psychologically in an extremely depressed condition and they asked me to travel with them to Niagara Falls and Detroit and Chicago and they were just visiting this country at the time, so I agreed and accompanied them. That is the major reason I went to Chicago, or went around these places.

But I utilized the opportunity to discuss these matters with Mr. Niebyl and Miss Kyle.

Senator JENNER. You made a trip into Wisconsin, too. What was the purpose of that trip?

Mr. TSURU. At that time I do not believe I made a trip, earlier I did.

Senator JENNER. Earlier, all right. What was the purpose of that trip into Wisconsin?

Mr. TSURU. I think I stated yesterday I attended summer schools, if I remember correctly, three times at the University of Wisconsin. The main reason being that, since I was originally a philosophy major in college and changed into economics later on, I had to catch up with some of my economics courses and I wanted to do so through training at summer school. And since I like Lake Mendota during the summer, I chose the University of Wisconsin to do so.

Senator JENNER. You financed your own education?

Mr. TSURU. I personally had no funds. My father did. Most of my college days. It was very difficult at the time to do any work under the immigration law. I could wash dishes, so I did such things occasionally. But otherwise my college days were financed by my father.

Senator JENNER. The Communist Party never paid for any of your trips out to Chicago to collaborate on this matter?

Mr. TSURU. Absolutely not.

Senator JENNER. No Communist contributed to your expenses?

Mr. TSURU. Absolutely not.

Senator JENNER. Mr. Parry or any of the other associate professors you referred to in your previous testimony never advanced you any money of any kind?

Mr. TSURU. No, sir.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit that I studied this document very carefully, and it has all the earmarks of being prepared by what the Communists call experienced "agitprop directors" of the Communist Party. Are you acquainted with that material, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. I am sorry, I am not acquainted with that term.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read sections of this. Senator JENNER. Proceed. It is all in the record.

Mr. MORRIS. First page, paragraph 3:

It is our opinion that SS did not appear accidentally at this particular time. The fact that a magazine of the similar nature has appeared in the last forty years in Germany, Russia, Switzerland, and Japan, while not in the Anglo-Saxon countries, especially not in the U. S., seems to us to reflect a basically uneven development, the recognition of which is fundamental to our determination of the method which we have to employ in regard to SS in the U. S. According to the analyses of the Seventh World Congress, capitalism has entered its crisis as such. For the U. S. this means that the very basis of the position of the intellectual—while we are not of the opinion that SS is only or even primarily directed to the intellectuals, a point which will be clarified later on, we think that it is best to develop our analysis from that specific point in the class struggle where SS originated, the intellectual—the economic basis for the opportunism and for the lack of their being forced to develop class consciousness in the form of revolutionary theory has withered away and that this necessity in many different forms was becoming apparent. Reviewed in this way, SS is not only a manifestation of the grown contradictions in the American capitalist society but represents in itself an active force and an important and indispensable weapon within the struggle of these contradictions.

I would like to move over to the next page, Senator, and—may I read parts of this in the interest of time?

Senator JENNER. Yes, proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. And if I seem to take anything out of context, in so moving will you let me know, Mr. Tsuru? Under part 1, there is a subdivision 1, 2, and 3.

1. We have to deepen or even first to prepare the ground for an understanding of the Marxist content of the magazine. Such a necessity is abundantly clear from the last issue. (We specifically refer to the articles by McGill, Struik, and Brameld.)

Who are McGill, Struik, and Brameld?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. McGill was one of the editors of Science and Society at the time. Mr. Struik was a professor of mathematics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and I believe he was either an editor or contributing editor. Brameld, this name I do not recall.

Mr. MORRIS. Is that Theodore Brameld?

Mr. TSURU. I do not recall, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS (reading):

2. We help these people already responsive to the magazine to find the "political" contents of the magazine.

3. We make a conscious effort of extending this field of responsiveness by organizing study groups around specific scientific fields, for instance, modern problems in physics, or relation of biology to political science, or the function of law and dictatorship, etc. etc., in each case bearing in mind that our function is to expose the inherent contradictions in the bourgeois approach and to lead the members of the study groups to realize the only correct approach: the approach of dialectic materialism.

Mr. MORRIS. Then I would like to go down to No. 1 in the next subdivision. [Reading:]

1. As far as intellectuals are concerned, their attending of classes in Workers Schools presupposes a definite decision on their part; not only many of them at the moment are not willing to make such a decision due to lack of conviction but many external circumstances impose the degree of precaution which they most certainly are not willing to forego before having attended a study group. Furthermore, there are a number of people whose right to precaution under the circumstances given would certainly not be denied.

2. Study groups are not to be perceived as regular courses beginning with the reading of Manifesto and ending with the application of the Third Volume of

Capital to their specific fields. Such a course would certainly belong to Workers Schools. Positive contents of such study groups have been outlined above.

3. There should be no reason why SS study groups could not be organized within the framework of Workers Schools as actually done in the W. S. here in Chicago. Such a group would serve a similar function as those groups mentioned before only for slightly more developed intellectuals who do not object to going to a W. S. but might find it difficult to start their Marxist education on an elementary basis. Secondly, there are those within such a group who are far more easily approached via their own fields.

Then I would like to skip to part 2, just a half page later. [Reading:]

PART TWO

In a letter by Stalin to the editors of the central organ of the YCL of the Soviet Union (unfortunately we do not have material with us to check) several years ago, Stalin stressed the great importance of the practical work performed in the Soviet Union since the revolution as something to be extremely proud of. But he said that little had been done for the struggle on the theoretical front. And this established one of the weakest points in the development of Soviet Union. He then stressed the responsibility of the Party and urged the concentration on this point. We think that a lesson could be taken from this letter to our own situation.

In other words, Mr. Tsuru, you invoked a letter by Mr. Stalin as a guide to your political activities at this time.

Mr. TSURU. As I indicated earlier, my part in drafting this memorandum I consider somewhat minor. I took the responsibility of putting down the name because I participated in a discussion while preparing for the draft, and I was the intermediary to carry, if it was completed, to Mr. Parry. So I took the responsibility of putting down the name, but actually, as I think you will be able to establish in the latter part of this memorandum, the memorandum refers to Lowe as Friend Lowe, whereas it refers to Niebyl by initials, KHN. I recall most of the parts of the things were written by Mr. Niebyl and my contribution was to participate in the discussion of certain aspects of the memorandum, so if you ask me if I invoke the letter by Stalin, the only thing I can say is to the extent I have put down the name, I am responsible, but it was so long as I can recall, not I who invoked Stalin.

Mr. SOURWINE. May I respectfully suggest this is at a time when the witness has already testified he was acting like a Communist, thinking like a Communist.

Now, in that connotation there is nothing remarkable about putting that in this memorandum.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, may I just read two more paragraphs, Senator? Senator JENNER. Proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. The next paragraph under part 2. [Reading:]

We feel it is our duty to ask ourselves the question: what work has been done in analyzing the present complex situation in this country. Most certainly the analysis of the Seventh World Congress has given the basis for the analysis which was concretized and applied to the US in the Ninth convention. These analyses, however, could stress because of their very nature only the changes in the basic structure as well as certain specific aspects of it. The manifestations of these changes in, for instance, bourgeois economic theory, philosophy, natural sciences, etc., still wait for appropriate analyses and even more, we are still waiting (and the fact that we are waiting is in itself an indictment) for an adequate expression of these changes in Marxist theoretical terms. The general attempt made in this direction is an analysis by Varga which should perform for us the same function as the Seventh World Congress to the Ninth Party Convention.

Now, again, "Should perform for us the same function as the Seventh World Congress to the Ninth Party Convention."

Mr. TSURU. I think I can only repeat the same as my answer to my part in the memorandum.

Mr. MORRIS. The next part only refers to Comrade Bittelman.

Senator JENNER. Was it your habit to refer to individuals as "Comrades"?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Chairman, I am clearly certain that it was Mr. Niebyl's writing. He referred to Mr. Bittelman as Comrade and a little further below he refers to me as "Friend."

Senator JENNER. But in the beginning of the paragraph you say—the word is, "we feel it is our duty to ask ourselves"—and then in the middle of the paragraph you say "Comrade." Now I ask you, do you refer to your friends as comrades?

Mr. TSURU. No, sir, I do not do so.

Senator JENNER. You never did.

Mr. TSURU. I never did.

Senator JENNER. Why did you sign this document then?

Mr. TSURU. Well, because—

Senator JENNER. Did you ask Mr. Niebyl to correct that and put Mr. Bittelman rather than Comrade Bittelman at any time?

Mr. TSURU. I am sorry, I did not do so.

Senator JENNER. Of course, you are sorry now.

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Senator JENNER. How long have you been sorry?

Mr. TSURU. Well, I think I expressed in my initial statement about the gradual changes in my views and I should say, if you would like me to develop on that point, probably I could spend a few minutes but I don't like to take up too much of the committee's time so I would ascribe my gradual transition to the period, the initial period from 1938 and 1939, but more intensively I began to change my views in the postwar period.

Senator JENNER. But when you were attached to SCAP under the command of General MacArthur, you hadn't clearly changed your views?

Mr. TSURU. I was attached to SCAP in 1946 and 1947 and I believe I had changed my views then.

Senator JENNER. All right, proceed.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Senator, I thought possibly when we got to that line of development I might ask a few questions. But excuse me, sir, I will go back and finish this line of questioning.

I have just one more letter I will offer the witness at this time, dated May 9, 1937, which was shown to the witness in the executive session this morning. It is addressed to Mr. Karl-Heinrich. It reads as follows:

DEAR KARL-HEINRICH :

I hope that the fact that I have not heard from you does not mean that you have been ill, but rather that you have been terrifically busy as usual.

Toward the end of March we started a new study group here for the study of American capitalism from the Marxist point of view. The group consists of young instructors and graduate students in economics, history, and law, including a few men who have already established some reputation in their own field like Paul Sweezy and Robert Bryce. Thus far we met five times and discussed five papers: "Marxian Methodology in Social Sciences" by myself, "National Income and its Distribution Among Different Classes" by L. Tarshis, "American Imperialism" by E. H. Norman, "Peculiarities of Capitalist Accumulation in U. S." by P. Sweezy, and "Agriculture in U. S. A." by R. Bryce. We plan to meet for the last time this year two weeks from today to discuss the program of a Farmer-Labor Party.

I haven't finished reading the letter but that is the part I want to ask you questions about.

(The letter referred to above was marked "Exhibit No. 451" and reads as follows:)

EXHIBIT NO. 451

36 CLAVERLY HALL,
Cambridge, Mass., May 9, 1937.

DEAR KARL HEINRICH: I hope that the fact that I have not heard from you does not mean that you have been ill, but rather that you have been terribly busy as usual.

Toward the end of March we started a new study group here for the study of American capitalism from the Marxist point of view. The group consists of young instructors and graduate students in economics, history and law, including a few men who have already established some reputation in their own field like Paul Sweezy and Robert Bryce. Thus far we met five times and discussed five papers: "Marxian Methodology in Social Science" by myself, "National Income and its Distribution among different Classes" by L. Tarshis, "American Imperialism" by E. H. Norman, "Peculiarities of Capitalist Accumulation in U. S." by P. Sweezy, and "Agriculture in U. S. A." by R. Bryce. We plan to meet for the last time this year two weeks from to-day to discuss the program of a Farmer-Labor Party. In the discussion of Bryce's paper, the question arose, in particular, if it is not increasingly likely that agricultural population as a whole would in future politically identify themselves as one in favoring such a measure as the AAA and that even tenant farmers and sharecroppers may line up with other sectors of agricultural population over against industrial population including industrial workers. How the program of a Farmer-Labor Party should take such a probability into consideration is one of the questions we shall discuss. Therefore, we wish to obtain some materials which explain the position of the Middle Western Farmer Labor groups on such questions. If you have them on hand, will you send them to me? Or, if you know some good articles on the subject in any of the national periodicals, will you let me know?

Other study groups are holding out quite nicely. Representatives of several study groups here sent a letter to the editors of S&S almost two months ago, asking certain specific questions and suggesting certain specific steps. But we have not heard a word from them yet.

Parry tells me that we printed 8,400 copies of S&S per issue for the last two times and we have about 1,500 annual subs, also that we need the total of 5,000 subs to make the magazine self-sustaining and otherwise we need \$2,000 contributions every year. "Otherwise" means "unless we do not get additional 3,500 subs." The editors are quite pessimistic about the prospect of getting more subs. But I think it is a mistake.

I also feel that it would be better to establish various departmental editorships. I envisage a wide potentiality under such a system. The present system with a hurried weekend editorial meeting once a month or so is almost an insult to the kind of work S&S is meant to be doing. We need more personnel with better organization, it seems to me.

If you are too busy, don't bother with those annotations which I asked you to write; and let me know whichever way you decide.

The recent sudden death of my mother will take me back to Japan this summer. But I hope to be back in U. S. in the fall.

(TSURU)

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Who were in that study group to the best of your recollection?

Mr. TSURU. First, I would like to state, this letter, although it is a copy, I am certain that I wrote it. And then as to Mr. Morris' question about the study group, as I now recall, although I would not have recalled the details, were it not for the fact that I have seen the letter, I now recall more details of the study group which consisted mainly of graduate students and instructors at Harvard, generally in the field of social science, economics, and history, to discuss among ourselves freely the question of American capitalism. Some of us in the study

group, not all of them, some of us including myself, and possibly Mr. Sweezy, had the idea of trying to test the theories of Karl Marx as they applied to American capitalism. I am certain others included in the study group were not, at least at the time I knew them then, so the discussion was quite free and flexible and we exchanged different points of view. And as Mr. Morris has read the part, we discussed a wide variety of subjects.

Mr. MORRIS. And who were in that study group?

Mr. TSURU. Oh, Miss—although I am not certain if all of them were present at every meeting, persons like Tarshis, Mr. Robert Bryce, Mr. Paul Sweezy, and Mr. E. H. Norman were present.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, when did you first meet Mr. Norman, for instance?

Mr. TSURU. I met Mr. Norman for the first time, I believe, in the spring of 1936. I cannot place exactly, but I said it is spring, because he was introduced to me through Mr. Robert Bryce, who is a Canadian economist, at the time a graduate student at Harvard University, and I believe I came to know Mr. Bryce only after several months of my academic year 1935 to 1936. Mr. Bryce introduced me to Mr. Norman at the dining room of one of the Harvard dormitories.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the excerpt from a security memorandum which has previously been entered into our record.¹ A reference contained therein which reads, "Tsuru Shigato, Japanese instructor at Harvard,"—That is you, is it not?

Mr. TSURU. Shigato is not quite correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, at that time—1942—you were being repatriated, were you not? It means in connection with the repatriation purposes of 1942. [Reading:]

The FBI was approached by Norman who represented himself as an official on highly confidential business of the Canadian Government in an effort to take custody of Tsuru's belongings.

One main item of these belongings was a complete record of the Nye munitions investigations, largely prepared by Alger Hiss.

Norman later admitted to the FBI agents in charge that his was only a personal interest and that he was not representing the Canadian Government as stated.

Another item among these belongings, as reported by the FBI, was a letter dated May 9, 1937, which related to a series of studies being promoted at Harvard by Tsuru which provided for the study of American capitalism from a Marxist viewpoint. The studies were conducted by a group of young instructors and graduate students which had met five times. They discussed certain papers which included "American Imperialism," by E. H. Norman.

Obviously that reference there is to the letter we have just been reading.

Now, can you tell us what precisely you did with all your personal papers and books after your repatriation in 1950?

Mr. TSURU. At the time of repatriation, that is to say, before I was repatriated, we had an intimation from, I think it was immigration authorities that, since we were living unmolested, paid by American institutions, our application for repatriation is likely to receive a low priority.

So, Mrs. Tsuru and I more or less decided in our own mind that we should stay on until probably 1943 or 1945, although we had applied for repatriation. And I negotiated with a number of professors at

¹ See Emmerson testimony March 12, 1957, pt. 56, Scope of Soviet Activity in the United States, p. 3645.

Harvard so that I could get research assistance grants for the following academic year of 1953—I am sorry, 1942 to 1943.

I was assured of such possibilities and we were under the impression that we would just go on living in Cambridge, but suddenly, I believe it was June the second, 1942, we received a telegram from the State Department saying that we are to be repatriated by the first boat and we are to report to the Ellis Islands by June the 7th, I believe, the exact date I am not quite certain now. Which meant that I had only a few days between the receipt of the telegram and the date of my departure. I was at the time correcting exam papers for a number of courses as well as doing certain assigned jobs at the Museum of Fine Arts. I felt it was my responsibility to finish the exam corrections and my assignments at the museum before I departed.

In fact, by the first week of June, most of the Harvard professors and faculty members usually would have left Cambridge to vacation, except those who are remaining for correction of papers. I could not ask anyone to take my place.

So I considered the question of packing my belongings a matter of lowest priority. Furthermore, the State Department instruction was that I was permitted to take only one big trunk per person. It specified the cubic feet, I am not quite sure, but I found out later on it was just about the size of one big trunk per person which meant I had to leave most of the things in Cambridge.

Therefore, I decided under the circumstances, which was quite an extraordinary circumstance, from the standpoint of a Japanese citizen, our own country being at war with the country where I had lived some years, and in my personal case, I was under the conviction that Japan should not have started the war, and also felt that Japan would be defeated. So my going back, to my mind, was to go back to Japan in order to reconstruct Japan somehow out of defeat. That was the deep determination I had in my mind.

From that standpoint, for me, books, papers, furniture and those things were entirely immaterial. Those were immaterial things to me. Although I had a large number of books and documents, I freely gave to some of the economist friends who came to my apartment before I left, the books which they wanted to have. I also contacted the library of Harvard, Japanese library, saying that I was willing to present my Japanese books to the library if they can find them useful. Otherwise I instructed the janitor of the apartment that he can have my furniture, kitchen utensils, radio, and, other things he wanted. Books and documents I was certain that he would have no use, so I suggested to him he can dispose of them in second-hand bookstores or just dispose of them as he liked.

One other item which I took care of was the making out of a box full of Japanese books which I intended to give to Mr. Norman because he had indicated while he was in this country a few years back of that period, that he wanted to obtain those books very much, but they were very difficult to get.

The major item in this box of books was volumes on source materials on the economic history of early Meiji period, that is to say, the third quarter of the 19th century.

I believe I included some other source books and economic history books and I left this box in care of International Student Association, it might have been called institute, I am not certain, which was

located on Phillips Place, Cambridge. Director at the time was Mr. Lawrence Mead. And I asked him if he would be willing to keep it until Mr. Norman calls for it.

Immediately, that is at the same time, I wrote a letter to Mr. Tarshis, whose name I mentioned earlier, who I knew to be a friend of Mr. Norman, asking him to get in touch with Mr. Norman when the latter returns.

I knew Mr. Norman to be in Japan at the time and gave him my instructions to proceed to International Student Institute to take that box. That is the way I more or less disposed or left behind my belongings.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, what happened as a matter of fact, do you know? You met Mr. Norman subsequently?

Mr. TSURU. Yes, as a matter of fact, repatriation, of course, was duly conducted. I came back to Japan in August 1942. And then I did serve for a while in the Japanese Army. When the war ended I was in the Japanese foreign office. Mr. Norman arrived in Tokyo, I believe some time in September, 1945. He called on our house, which he did not know to be our house, but knew to be the house of my wife's parents, to find out where we were.

Mr. MORRIS. This is what year now?

Mr. TSURU. September of 1945, either the end of September or early October. It was just about that time—1945.

And it happened that after our house has been bombed in Tokyo, Mrs. Tsuru and I moved to the house of her own father. We were living in that house which happened to be located not very far from the location of Canadian Legation in Tokyo and I presume that he dropped in at Mr. Wada's house to find out where we were and found us there. So, of course, we were very much surprised to see him so quickly after the war, and since that first meeting after the war, I think I met him a number of times.

Mr. MORRIS. Approximately how many times?

Mr. TSURU. Oh, I should say in the course of the period from 1945 to—now I am not quite sure of the date of his departure from Japan and meanwhile he also left Japan and came back again as I know, because he was first with the SCAP and later he came as the Chief of the Canadian Legation, so there was an interval there and I think he left most likely around 1950. And subsequently I know he came to Japan, but I did not meet him at the time. I met him during those approximately 4½ years or so, possibly 20 times or so.

Senator JENNER. Did you serve with him in SCAP?

Mr. TSURU. Pardon.

Senator JENNER. Did you serve with him in SCAP?

Mr. TSURU. No, he was under different jurisdiction within the SCAP. I was in the Economics and Scientific Section headed by General Marquat, attached to the Research and Statistics Division within that section. Mr. Norman I understood to be working in the, some kind of intelligence service or something, I believe, under, if I correctly remember, under General Thorpe.

And during the course of my meeting with Mr. Norman, a number of times, that is subsequent to the first meeting, I inquired of him whether he finally got those books at the International Students Institute and I believe he said he got them.

And furthermore, he indicated to me voluntarily not in response to my prompting, but he indicated to me he also visited the apartment house where I used to live, which incidentally is on Martin Street, Cambridge.

I am sorry I was not quite correct in my statement. I should have said: "not in response to my questioning, Mr. Norman related to me" that he visited the apartment house where I lived and inquired of the janitor of the apartment house about my belongings, with a hope, according to Mr. Norman, to obtain some further books on Japanese history which I possessed in large number.

Apparently he had such a hope. But after dealing with the janitor for a while, he did not get a very cooperative attitude he told me. The janitor looked somewhat queer and not very—he appeared to be equivocal about the whole matter. Although Mr. Norman pressed it, he couldn't get anywhere with it.

Mr. MORRIS. You say he pressed it with the janitor to have a look at all your papers and books.

Mr. TSURU. Well, I gathered that Mr. Norman pressed, did Mr. Tsuru leave other belongings here and if so he would like to find out if he could get hold of some more Japanese books.

I do not remember the exact words which Mr. Norman said to the janitor.

Mr. MORRIS. Did he tell you he had represented himself as an official of the Canadian Government?

Mr. TSURU. Not that I recall.

Mr. MORRIS. He didn't indicate that at all?

Mr. TSURU. Not that I recall. But I believe he told me he visited the place twice or he first visited it once and then made an approach the second time, in what means I do not know, but I remember he said he made attempts twice.

Mr. MORRIS. And you did say he pressed on the point?

Mr. TSURU. Yes, he pressed on the point that he wanted to see it, but could not get anywhere so he went back. So he told me now he doesn't know what happened to my belongings which I left at the apartment.

Mr. MORRIS. And some of which have come into the record of the Internal Subcommittee and has given us valuable information.

Mr. TSURU. Yes, much to my own shame of the period which is covered.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know a man named Israel Halperin?

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was Israel Halperin?

Mr. TSURU. I knew him as an instructor of the mathematics at Harvard University. He might have been a research associate, the official title I do not know. He was introduced to me, I believe, by Mr. Norman. The year I cannot remember quite exactly, but possibly around 1937.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, this is the same man who was arrested in the Canadian espionage case in 1934?

Mr. TSURU. That I did not know, but I knew it later because I was questioned about him by United States Government representatives in Japan.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know your name appeared in his address book at the time of his arrest?

Mr. TSURU. I did not know my name appeared there.

Mr. MORRIS. How late did you see Mr. Halperin prior to that time?

Mr. TSURU. He never met my wife so I think I am pretty certain it was before I got married. I got married June 29, 1939, therefore, it was before that time.

Mr. MORRIS. I see—1939.

Mr. TSURU. 1939.

Mr. MORRIS. So you didn't see him from 1939 to 1946?

Mr. TSURU. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, do you know a man named Harry F. Alber?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Harry Alber was in the Economics and Scientific Section of SCAP in Japan at the time I was employed by the Economics and Scientific Section from 1946 to 1947. He was, however, in a different division.

I was in Research and Statistics Division, but Mr. Alber was, I think, in Price Control Division. And I came to know him through this, more or less official connections of my job as economist in the ESS. The question arose as to which years of the prewar Japan should we use as the basis of various index numbers, price level, and so forth. I was brought into the Price Control Division, Chief of the Price Control Division, I do not recall now, but Mr. Alber was there. That was the first time I met him in the office of the Chief of the Price Control Division in ESS. We discussed about the appropriate basis for various indices of Japan, the prewar years. Since then I came to know him. I believe he left the SCAP after a while and even after he left the SCAP I think I met him a number of times.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you now adviser to his firm in Tokyo?

Mr. TSURU. At first he asked me to be an adviser. I think it was called—

Mr. MORRIS. International Economic Service, Ltd.; is that it?

Mr. TSURU. I am not quite certain of the name but I know he had a firm of consultants, and since I know him sufficiently to call him by his first name, he asked me to be an adviser or consultant, that is to help him along, and I said not in a formal way, but I shall be glad to drop in every once in a while to give any knowledge of mine which will be helpful to him. So I think I visited his office altogether about, between 5 and 10 times, I should say.

Mr. MORRIS. You have been advising him then, you say informally?

Mr. TSURU. Actually it never came to that. That is to say, there was a question of remuneration. To advise any service, of course, it is natural that Mr. Alber feels he should pay me. Now I said, "No, I don't like to have such an arrangement," so then Alber thought—he had some other ideas, we were on friendly terms with him discussing various questions, but never came to actual solid advising work.

Mr. MORRIS. And when did you last see Mr. Alber?

Mr. TSURU. I saw him for the last time, I should say, when he told me that he was being investigated and he told me about that matter and he was very much concerned about it and that was the time—might have been 1949 or 1950.

Mr. MORRIS. You have not seen him since that time?

Mr. TSURU. I have not seen him since.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know he had been indicted by a Newport News, Va., grand jury on charges he committed perjury before the Army Department Security Board, April 29, 1951, hearing?

Mr. TSURU. I did not know that.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know he was an American Communist?

Mr. TSURU. I did not know he was an American Communist.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Tsuru, were you instrumental in the resuscitation of the Japanese Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations in the postwar period?

Mr. TSURU. I think it would be unfair to many others who were very active in the resuscitation of the IPR if I say I was instrumental. I had participated in it. But honestly speaking, I should say, there were a few others who were more active.

Mr. MORRIS. But you were one of those people who helped to reactivate the Japanese Council of the Institute?

Mr. TSURU. I was one of those who participated in discussing the idea of reviving.

Mr. MORRIS. When was this, 1946?

Mr. TSURU. We may have started discussing it late 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know at that time it was a vehicle for Communist operation?

Mr. TSURU. Well, in the initial stage of attempt to resuscitate the IPR we had no inkling of this kind of thing, of course. I think it would be most correct if I put it this way, that some of the elder members of the active persons who wanted to resuscitate IPR became more and more concerned after they had been communicating with, I think, Mr. Holland, I believe, Mr. William Holland, that IPR was sort of under the clouds, and Japan should be very careful about choosing what kinds of people to work actively in IPR. So, a large number of people at first were engaged in the resuscitation but there was a process of selection which went on gradually dropping out younger members, and at the time it was formally organized, possibly about 1948, I was a member of the research committee of the IPR but not a member of the board of directors of the Japanese IPR.

Mr. MORRIS. You had been active in a moderate way in the Institute of Pacific Relations in the United States; had you not?

Mr. TSURU. In a moderate way I was active in seeing the people in IPR because Mr. Carter—I think it was Mr. Carter—Mr. Carter asked me a number of times my opinions.

Mr. MORRIS. You knew Fred Field well; did you not?

Mr. TSURU. No; I did not know Mr. Fred Field well. I think I met him only once.

Mr. MORRIS. You know for instance that you were recommended to do research work for the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. TSURU. I was?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. Which year was it, may I ask?

Mr. MORRIS. 1938 and 1939—1938.

Mr. TSURU. It is quite possible that that happened.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you know a man named Chao-Ting Chi?

Mr. TSURU. Chinese?

Mr. MORRIS. He was a Chinese Communist in the United States and is now with the Red Chinese government.

Mr. TSURU. I know he is in China.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. I did not know him to be a Chinese Communist in the United States, but I met him a number of times at the IPR.

Mr. MORRIS. When did you last see Chao-Ting Chi?

Mr. TSURU. I saw him most likely around this period in 1938.

Mr. MORRIS. You didn't see him in Japan?

Mr. TSURU. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Are you active with the Institute of Pacific Relations now?

Mr. TSURU. No, Mr. Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you tell us the circumstances of your leaving that particular group?

Mr. TSURU. I was a member of the research committee, I think about 1947 or 1948 and I contributed a paper for the IPR Lucknow conference—that is a city in India—which I believe was held in 1950. And I asked to be present at the conference but the board of directors of the IPR suggested that it was not wise for me to go to the conference and of course I inquired why. They said, "You seem to be suspected of something."

Mr. MORRIS. That is by the Japanese Government.

Mr. TSURU. I don't know whether it was by the Japanese Government or by some other authorities, I do not know, but I received intimation that I was likely to be—

Now, the board of directors, since I was not a member of the board of directors, I do not know the names of all of them, but I think the intimation to that effect was of a sort of general character, so I can't specify who said it to me, but I am trying to reconstruct from my memory why I did not go to Lucknow.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, I wish you would.

Mr. TSURU. The board of directors consisted then, I believe, of persons like Mr. Saburo Matsukata.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you spell that for the reporter.

Mr. TSURU. Yes, S-a-b-u-r-o M-a-t-s-u-k-a-t-a.

And I think Mr. Matsumoto. At least I believe those two names were contained. And Mr. Matsuo, M-a-t-s-u-o, was I believe, the secretary of the IPR that participated in the discussion of the board of directors and I believe it was through Mr. Matsuo that I got the intimation that in the discussion of the board of directors they were likely to come to difficulties of some sort, and I was very curious about it, but it couldn't be helped, so I said, "All right, I will submit my paper and someone will read it. I shall not participate at the conference."

Mr. SOURWINE. That was Matsuhei.

Mr. TSURU. M-a-t-s-u-h-e-i.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know him before he went with IPR?

Mr. TSURU. I knew him only slightly when he was in this country before the war, but we happened to be repatriated by the same boat, and our rooms happened to be next door in the *Gripsholm*, and they had no children, we had no children, we were about the same age, we came to know quite well the *Gripsholm*.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know him in Tokyo?

Mr. TSURU. Pardon.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know him in Tokyo while you were with SCAP?

Mr. TSURU. While I was with SCAP I think I visited his office.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you know what he did, where he was employed?

Mr. TSURU. Where he was employed?

Senator JENNER. Where he was employed.

Mr. MORRIS. Where he was employed.

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Matsumo, I thought he had some connection with the IPR.

Mr. SOURWINE. He left a position with the office of political adviser in Tokyo to take the job with IPR. Didn't you know that?

Mr. MORRIS. Did you have anything to do with inducing him to take that job with IPR?

Mr. TSURU. Matsuo?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. I don't recall that I did.

Mr. MORRIS. Weren't you one of those at least one of those who urged him to leave his position with the political adviser and go and undertake the job in connection with the reorganization of IPR?

Mr. TSURU. Political adviser's office where, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. The office of the political adviser in the American Embassy.

Mr. TSURU. Oh, I see.

Mr. SOURWINE. Didn't you know he worked there?

Mr. TSURU. Before the war.

Mr. SOURWINE. No.

Mr. TSURU. Oh, after the war.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. I was referring to the period before the war.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. Before the war when I did not know him very well and then I said I came to know him quite well.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is right.

Mr. TSURU. And then in the postwar period so far as my recollection goes, I did not advise him to leave the political adviser's office of the United States Government and try to reconstruct IPR. I had the impression that he was the driving spirit of the resuscitation of IPR. He was very active in trying to resuscitate. I think he even went through some privations at one time because funds were short, and so forth, but he was still determined to carry it out—the original intentions.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you for letting me inquire.

Mr. TSURU. But I wanted to finish the part you asked me, Mr. Morris. Then probably 1951 or so I began to hear about the investigations about this Senate committee on the IPR. I think it appeared in Time, I believe. I saw it in one of the American magazines. And then saw it in some other papers also, and I think I can't recall all the things where I saw the reference to the investigation but I had the general information that IPR was being investigated by the Senate committee.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you know Mr. Saionji?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Koichi—

Mr. MORRIS. I think he was arrested in the Sorge espionage case in Japan.

Mr. TSURU. That I don't know. Koichi, I think his name, his first name is. I met him probably—

Mr. MORRIS. He is active in the postwar IPR?

Mr. TSURU. I think he was in and out but at least at one time his name was definitely on it.

Mr. MORRIS. But you don't know him well?

Mr. TSURU. I don't know him well.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know a man named Mark Nathan Rosenfeld from Spencerville, Md.?

Mr. TSURU. Yes, he was one of the superiors. One of the superiors when I was in the Economics and Scientific Section in SCAP.

Mr. MORRIS. He isn't one that recruited you for service in the Economics Section?

Mr. TSURU. No, Mr. Morris, the way I was recruited was, I was a permanent Government official in the foreign office with permanent status. My superior was Mr. Shigeru Yoshida and I believe it was some time in February 1946, he called me to his office, I was in one of the bureaus of the foreign office at the time and he told me SCAP would like to have a Japanese expert to help them on some Japanese matters. And he suggested: "now you are well versed with the English language. You know some American people. And also you are an economist although you are working in the foreign office now, why don't you go there." And I said, "Well, if the Minister suggests that I should go, I shall be glad to do so," and it was an entirely official transfer, so my status even while I was in SCAP was a foreign officer's, sort of on lend-lease agreement or arrangement to the SCAP. And I was assigned to the Research and Statistics Division where Mr. Rosenfeld was one of my superiors.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, did you bring in Mr. Takahashi?

Mr. TSURU. Professor Masao Takahashi. I think it is correct to say I was instrumental in bringing Takahashi into the office.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you say the same of Mr. Jiro Ando?

Mr. TSURU. In this case I am pretty certain by that time—may be Professor Takahashi came in almost immediately after I came in upon my suggestion, and then in the Research and Statistical Division, we were told by the superiors—I think, Mr. Emerson Ross was the Chief of the Division at the time—that they would like to build up a fairly large corps of Japanese experts and Japanese statisticians, helpers, and so forth.

And at the time there were only 3 or 4 of us. So we Japanese sat together and wanted to regularize the method instead of just picking up any one certain person, we wanted to have a sort of regulatory process of selection on the basis of competence, qualifications, and so forth. So I believe after Mr. Takahashi came in, about four of us Japanese who were there, with consultation of the Japanese consultant in the personnel office in the Research and Statistics Division, we used to interview a large number of people together. And I think Mr. Ando was brought in as one of them.

Mr. MORRIS. Had he a record of being a Communist, do you know?

Mr. TSURU. Well, at the time we examined him, there was no such record. But after he was in the office for a while, I soon got the impression that he had strongly leftwing tendencies, so I felt it was my responsibility as one of the senior experts in the Division to advise him to resign. How he resigned I am not quite aware, but I think he either resigned or was ousted or I don't know, anyway he left the office after a while.

Mr. MORRIS. Was Mr. Phillip O. Keeney, in the office?

Mr. TSURU. I do not know the name.

Mr. MORRIS. You knew Solomon Adler?

Mr. TSURU. No, sir, I have never known him.

Mr. MORRIS. You haven't met Solomon Adler in Japan?

Mr. TSURU. No, I have not.

Mr. MORRIS. You know the man to whom I refer. He is one of the people who is publishing a book we mentioned yesterday.

Mr. TSURU. Yes, I recall the name, but I don't know him.

Mr. MORRIS. How about a man named Theodore Cohen?

Mr. TSURU. Theodore Cohen.

Mr. MORRIS. In Japan, an American.

Mr. TSURU. Oh, now I recall. He was one of the senior members, I believe, of the Economics and Scientific Section of the SCAP in the immediate postwar period in charge at first of labor problems.

Mr. MORRIS. And you met him?

Mr. TSURU. I knew him in my—more in my official capacity as vice minister of Economics Stabilization Board during the period 1947 and 1948 and I had to deal with him on various matters.

Mr. MORRIS. Now in 1952, you were invited to attend a world peace council in Moscow, were you not?

Mr. TSURU. 1952—yes, I was not invited, but I received a letter from Mr. Oscar Lange.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Oscar Lange?

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. He was then a Polish Communist official?

Mr. TSURU. Well, I understood him to be at first Polish Ambassador to the United States and then chief delegate to the United Nations from Poland and then I understood him to have gone back to Poland but at the time I understood him to belong to United Workers Party in Poland, which is a coalition of various parties and I understood him to be not in good favor of the Communist Central.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Bialer who was one of the high officials of the Communist Poland Party, who defected in 1956, told us that Mr. Lange had become a full-fledged member of the Communist Party and, when we last heard, he was in India on a mission for the Polish Government.

Mr. TSURU. I received a letter from Mr. Oscar Lange suggesting if I would not come and attend Moscow economics conferences and I answered him, I think it was in 1952, and said, "I personally would not be able to do so." I did not give any reason but I declined. So I never received an invitation. I know a number of persons who received invitations and I saw the type of letters which were received by them, but the only thing I received was a letter from Mr. Lange, I suppose, trying to sound out if I would be able to come and I answered him I would not be able to come.

Mr. MORRIS. Had the Japanese Government said you would not be able to go?

Mr. TSURU. No, not for such reasons, but I personally did not like to go to this Moscow conference at the time.

Mr. MORRIS. Didn't the Japanese Government forbid you to go?

Mr. TSURU. The Japanese Government never entered into this matter so far as I was concerned.

Mr. MORRIS. In order to go there you would have to have a passport issued to you?

Mr. TSURU. Passport according to the Japanese law can be issued with a certain destination and you could go to a country which is not included in the destination if you—I believe—if you get clearance from the consulate and then visas from the countries, but since Russia, at the time, was not a country with which Japan had diplomatic relations, Japan considered the travel towards Moscow or Soviet Union to be not a favorable thing for one to do. And I believe persons who went to Moscow at the time actually broke the passport law. But it just happened that the passport law had no punishment clause on that score, so they could not be punished legally.

Now, I suppose the Japanese Government is trying to amend it, but that is the incidental knowledge I have on the subject.

Mr. MORRIS. And you have been to Moscow for the foreign office?

Mr. TSURU. I was in Moscow as a member of the foreign office in April 1945.

Mr. MORRIS. What was the nature of that assignment, if it is appropriate for me to ask.

Mr. TSURU. I think it is quite all right for me to say now, even without consulting the Japanese Embassy.

Mr. MORRIS. I mean if you feel there is any—

Mr. TSURU. I feel it is quite all right. I was what they call diplomatic courier carrying various messages, documents, materials, goods in suitcases,—I am just given the duty of carrying it safely to Moscow. And then there were 3 important posts in Russia at that time, and I stopped at each 1 of these places to deliver these things, included Moscow with the other towns and the responsible officer will again fill the suitcases and then I could go back. That is what the purpose was.

Mr. MORRIS. And did you just make one trip, Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. TSURU. Just one trip.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more questions of this witness.

Now, I think, however, you did not obtain that volume—you know, the reference to Kaiso?

Mr. TSURU. No, I am sorry.

Mr. MORRIS. We have been trying to get it, now Mr. Mandel has tried to get it, Senator, from the Library of Congress.

Mr. MANDEL. I have not yet received it.

Mr. TSURU. Well, Mr. Chairman, I shall be quite happy to cooperate with the committee in obtaining a copy, if I can, in this country, and sending it to you.

Senator JENNER. All right.

Mr. MORRIS. And you also have written for American periodicals from time to time, have you not? For instance I refer to an article of yours in the Atlantic Monthly in January 1955, and an article in the American Academy of Policy and Sociology of 1956.

Mr. TSURU. Yes, I have.

Senator JENNER. Anything further?

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no more questions except as I say, the subpoenas have been issued for Mr. Niebyl and Constance Kyle and we hope they may be able to give us further information.

Mr. Sourwine may have a few questions.

Senator JENNER. Do you have any questions, Mr. Sourwine?

Mr. SOURWINE. Is this a proper time for it?

Senator JENNER. Well, there will be no hearing this afternoon. We would like to finish with this witness if we can. It is the witness' desire to finish completely the testimony.

Mr. SOURWINE. In your letter of August 31, 1936 you referred to—
Mr. Korb—

Can you identify any of the members of that group referred to in that letter?

Mr. TSURU. I can now recall the name, Mr. Korb, but I do not recall anyone in the group.

Mr. SOURWINE. Which Mr. Korb was that?

Mr. TSURU. I don't remember his first name.

Mr. SOURWINE. You referred to the Lunning group which arose among the members of the law school. Which Mr. Lunning was that?

Mr. TSURU. I believe his first name was Jus.

Mr. SOURWINE. Can you identify any of the members of that group?

Mr. TSURU. Well, Mr. Sourwine, I had the knowledge of these groups, but I did not necessarily—

Mr. SOURWINE. I am not arguing with you. Just asking, if you don't recall, just say so.

Mr. TSURU. I am sorry, I don't recall any names.

Mr. SOURWINE. You referred to a study group on Marxism. Can you recall any of the members of that group?

Mr. TSURU. Here I think names I originally did not recall, but after reading through these letters, the names of John Cookson and Herman Ramras, those names came back to my mind and I believe they were connected with the study group in Madison.

Mr. SOURWINE. You referred to the group on dialectic materialism in Cambridge. Can you identify that group any better?

Mr. TSURU. I think, now here again I am mentioning the groups but I am not necessarily a member of the groups. I think William Parry, Louis Harap.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is H-a-r-a-p?

Mr. TSURU. Yes. And although I am not quite certain, so if you permit me to answer with some degree of doubt, I shall mention another name. Shall I or not?

Mr. SOURWINE. Go ahead.

Mr. TSURU. With that proviso I would say Mr. Leo Roberts.

Mr. SOURWINE. Who was he?

Mr. TSURU. He was, I would characterize him as a perennial student of philosophy. He never seems to complete his book.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where is he now?

Mr. TSURU. I think he is in Cambridge.

Mr. SOURWINE. In this same letter you refer to discussions you had with the staff of the school, that school was the University of Chicago, was it not?

Mr. TSURU. Which page may I ask?

Mr. SOURWINE. Page 2 of the mimeographed copy down at the bottom. It is the third line from the bottom.

Mr. TSURU. Oh. I said I should try to discuss with the staff of the school.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. So far as my recollection goes, I never did because in Chicago—

Mr. SOURWINE. You were talking about the University of Chicago, were you not?

Mr. TSURU. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOURWINE. When was it that you had intended to discuss that matter with the staff of the school?

Mr. TSURU. By which I meant to discuss with Mr. Niebyl in the first instance and then on this question ask Mr. Niebyl to get in contact with the school.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, now on the next page of that letter, you speak of the agent in Chicago. Who was that?

Mr. TSURU. Well, here probably my inadequate language was misleading. What I meant, I think, was the question of Science and Society, whoever was willing, the person or persons whoever were willing to take the responsibility of promoting Science and Society.

Mr. SOURWINE. You did not have in mind any particular individual?

Mr. TSURU. No, I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. In your letter of September 6—I have no more questions.

Senator JENNER. I have to leave. The committee will just stand in recess, and the continuation of these questions will be after lunch, whatever time you say.

Mr. SOURWINE. That is why I was inquiring whether you were able to continue.

Senator JENNER. I can go on 5 or 10 minutes and you can continue.

Mr. SOURWINE. It is at the Senator's convenience.

Senator JENNER. Do you want to do it this afternoon or how long would it take you this morning?

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, we can go ahead then.

I would like to finish to accommodate the witness.

Mr. SOURWINE. Referring to the letter of September 6, to you, the fourth line from the top on the first page, there was a sentence mentioning—who was that?

Mr. TSURU. That is Mr. Kenneth Howard.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right. Now, referring to the second page of that letter as mimeographed, in the second paragraph on that page, the bottom line there is a Bernal. Can you identify that individual?

Mr. TSURU. This letter was written by Mr. Parry and I presumed him to mean a Doctor Bernal of Cambridge, whom I do not know.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, looking at the letter of September 14, the second paragraph, you say, "We called a meeting in Cambridge." Who was the "we" referred to there?

Mr. TSURU. Oh, I think I do not recall all the names, but at least Mr. Parry and Mr. Hanap were there.

Mr. SOURWINE. Thank you. Now in the letter of January 13, to Karl-Heinrich, in the third paragraph, the second line, you will find the name Webbs. What person or persons are referred to there?

Mr. TSURU. I think this—from internal evidence I would say I consider Sidney and Beatrice Webb of England.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, if you will look at the letter of February 2, 1937, to Karl-Heinrich.

Mr. TSURU. Excuse me just a minute please. Oh, yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. The second paragraph, the second line you will see the name Burgum. Have you identified that individual?

Mr. TSURU. Oh. Burgum. I think he was one of the editors of Science and Society from the beginning and I saw him, I believe, for the first time on this occasion when he came to Boston.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you recall his full name?

Mr. TSURU. I am sorry, I do not know his first name.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, on that same page, do you see the name, Struik?

Mr. TSURU. Yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Does that refer to Prof. Dirk Struik?

(No answer.)

Mr. SOURWINE. On the third page of that letter you will see the reference to the editors of Science and Society being terrifically busy on other duties of theirs in the fight against Trotskyists. Did you refer to duties as Communists?

Mr. TSURU. I believe I was relating the information from Mr. Parry.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were distinguishing between duties as Communists from duties as editors?

Mr. TSURU. I was relating to Mr. Parry's words and when he said, "Did you fight against Trotskyists," I was repeating.

Mr. SOURWINE. You were complaining that their Communist duties were interfering with what you understood to be their duties as editors?

Mr. TSURU. Yes; that is more or less the case.

Mr. SOURWINE. Now, look at the letter from Constance Kyle to you, April 14, the first paragraph. Look at the third and fourth lines from the bottom of that paragraph, you will find the phrase, "Our own people," referred to twice. How did you understand that phrase?

Mr. TSURU. Well, I think I interpreted this to mean that Miss Kyle was referring to the Communist group.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, sir. Mr. Tsuru, did you ever have any acquaintance with Mr. Andrew Roth?

Mr. TSURU. No; I have not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Mr. Phillip Jaffe?

Mr. TSURU. I saw him, I think, a couple of times at IPR.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do you remember who introduced you?

Mr. TSURU. Well, I am not quite sure who introduced us. IPR office at the time was such that people could come around and see each other and help each other and say "Hello," and introduce each other.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever hear of the Japan Anti-War League?

Mr. TSURU. Japan Anti-War League.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. You are not referring to the organization I was attached to, Anti-Imperialism League, of my student days?

Mr. SOURWINE. I didn't mean to make such a reference; if there was a connection I would be glad to have you tell us.

Mr. TSURU. I have been telling about the Anti-Imperialism.

Mr. SOURWINE. I understand that, but if there is any connection about the—

Did you know Wataru Raj, a Japanese by that name?

Mr. TSURU. Wataru Raj.

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes.

Mr. TSURU. Wataru sounds like a first name only. It is most unlikely that it is a last name.

Mr. SOURWINE. It does not sound like a last name.

Mr. TSURU. I don't think I know anyone by that name.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know of the Japanese Emancipation League?

Mr. TSURU. No; I did not.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Joja Kiroshi?

Mr. TSURU. Joja Kiroshi?

Mr. SOURWINE. J-o-j-a K-i-r-o-s-h-i.

Mr. TSURU. I do not think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. This Wataru apparently had the surname Kiroshi.

Mr. TSURU. Oh, no.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you ever know Nozaka Sazo?

Mr. TSURU. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Otherwise known as Susumu Okano?

Mr. TSURU. Except I met him, because you see when I was in the government, I think he came once to protest something to my office, I know the face.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Emmerson Ross?

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Emmerson Ross, the Chief of the Research and Statistics Division, yes. At the time I was in the SCAP.

Mr. SOURWINE. How well did you know him?

Mr. TSURU. Only to the extent of my being subordinated in that office.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Mr. Ross as a head of a group of persons in SCAP, who advocated collectivism and state ownership of Japan industry.

Mr. TSURU. No; I was not aware of such ideas on his part.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Kyuichi Tokuda?

Mr. TSURU. No; I never knew him. Again I saw his face.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Yoshio Shiga?

Mr. TSURU. I never knew him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Anthony Constantino? ¹

Mr. TSURU. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know James Fitzgerald? ¹

Mr. TSURU. No; I do not think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Maturos?

Mr. TSURU. I don't think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know T. A. Bisson?

Mr. TSURU. I knew him.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know him in IPR or otherwise?

Mr. TSURU. I knew him before the war at the IPR and then after the war I saw him a number of times when he was connected with the SCAP, Government Section, I believe.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Miriam Farley?

Mr. TSURU. I think I met her a few times before the war.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Henry Brenner?

Mr. TSURU. No; I don't think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. You knew Miss Farley in connection with IPR?

Mr. TSURU. That is right.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know Edward Christy Welch?

Mr. TSURU. Edward Welch.

¹ In a letter to the subcommittee dated April 27, 1957, Mr. Tsuru said: "After rereading the transcript, I now recall that I may have met Messrs. Constantino and Fitzgerald, about whom I was questioned at p. 5057 of the transcript, in Japan during the period immediately following the war."

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes. Welch.

Mr. TSURU. Edward Welch. Is he the one—may I ask a question? Is he the one who was in the SCAP in antimonopoly legislation?

Mr. SOURWINE. He was with the SCAP.

Mr. TSURU. Then I think I met him in my official capacity.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know James Killem?¹

Mr. TSURU. James Killem. No; I do not think so.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know William V. Turnage?

Mr. TSURU. Yes; he was one of the superiors in the Research and Statistics Division.

Mr. SOURWINE. Did you know any of those individuals in SCAP whose identity we have just been discussing as Communists or pro-Communists?

Mr. TSURU. No; I was not aware of any such tendencies among these people.

Mr. SOURWINE. One more question, Mr. Chairman.

If I remember correctly you stated in your initial testimony you would be willing to give the committee the names of Communists so far as you knew them or had reason to suspect them. Have you done so?

Mr. TSURU. Well, in trying to answer every question presented to me, I have tried my best to answer as fully and truthfully as I could.

Mr. SOURWINE. Have you given the committee the names of all the persons whom you knew or had reason to believe were Communists?

Mr. TSURU. As far as I can recall; yes.

Mr. SOURWINE. Will you be willing to attempt to make a list of all such persons that you can recall, and furnish the committee with it, or in the alternative, with a statement that on second thought and careful consideration you are unable to recall any other individuals known to you or that you had reason to believe were Communists.

Mr. TSURU. Mr. Chairman, I shall be willing to be at your service for any further works of the committee for which I am required. So that if my service in regard to what Mr. Sourwine has just indicated is called for, I shall be glad to be at your service.

Senator JENNER. We are trying to accommodate you and conclude this hearing. What the committee is interested in hearing is if you have any other people that you know to be Communists or pro-Communists, would you submit them to this committee by mail or through your attorney?

Mr. TSURU. I shall try my best to recollect of my past and try to cooperate with the committee to the best of my ability.¹

Senator JENNER. Thank you very much.

Any further questions? If not the committee will stand adjourned. (Whereupon, at 2 p. m., the committee was adjourned.)

¹ In a letter to the subcommittee dated April 27, 1957, Mr. Tsuru said:

"At p. 5058 of the transcript I was questioned by Mr. Sourwine about an individual whose last name he spelled "Killem." If the spelling is "Killen" rather than "Killem" I believe that I met such an individual a few times in Tokyo in 1947 in my official capacity as Vice Minister of Economic Stabilization."

¹ In a letter to the subcommittee dated April 27, 1957, Mr. Tsuru said:

"At the conclusion of the hearing on March 27 I was asked to furnish the subcommittee with the names of persons whom I know or knew to be Communists, or whom I reasonably believe or believed to be Communists, in addition to those names in such categories about which I had been questioned during the course of the hearing. I assume that the scope of this question is limited to United States citizens and persons within the United States since, in the course of my duties as Vice Minister of Economic Stabilization in Japan, I necessarily came in contact with some Japanese who are known in Japan and elsewhere as members of the Japanese Communist Party. After careful consideration I find that I cannot supply the subcommittee with any such names simply because I cannot recall any."

APPENDIX I

THE INTELLECTUAL INTERCHANGE PROGRAM

The America-Japan intellectual interchange program was established in the fall of 1951 to enable Japanese scholars and men of learning to come to the United States for limited periods of time (1) to visit American universities and other institutions in which they might be interested, and (2) to serve as visiting lecturers and conduct research in American institutions of higher learning. Under the other part of the interchange program, American scholars and men of learning visit Japan.

To administer the program two committees were established by Columbia University: One in Japan and the other in the United States. Dr. Yasaka Takagi, professor emeritus of American constitutional law at Toyko University, is chairman of the Japan committee. Others associated with him are Mr. Gordon T. Bowles, Mr. Shigeharu Matsumoto, Dr. Arao Imamura, Miss Tano Jodai, Prof. Naoto Kameyama, Dr. Shinzo Koizumi, Mr. Saburo Matsukata, Mr. Tamon Maeda, Miss Kiyoko Takeda, and Mrs. Matsu Tsuji.

The American committee is headed by Dr. Hugh Borton, professor of Japanese and director of the East Asian Institute at Columbia University. His committee colleagues include Dr. Charles W. Cole, president of Amherst College; Prof. Peter Odegard, chairman, department of political science at the University of California; Dr. Oliver Carmichael, former president of the University of Alabama; Dr. Merle Curti, professor of history at the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Edwin Reischauer, professor of Japanese at Harvard; Dr. Frederick S. Dunn, director of international studies at Princeton University; Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review; Prof. John Orchard of the department of geography at Columbia University; and Profs. Carrington Goodrich and William T. DeBary of the department of Chinese at Columbia University. Harry J. Carman, dean emeritus of Columbia College and Moore professor of history at Columbia University, is executive secretary of the program.

Each committee furnishes nominees for the consideration of the other. The Japanese who have come to the United States are:

Miss Fusae Ichikawa, president of Japan's League of Women Voters, 1952-53.

Dr. Yoshishige Abe, president of Peers College, Tokyo, 1952-53.

Dr. Hitoshi Kihara, geneticist, Kyoto University, 1953.

Mr. Yoshiro Nagayo, writer, 1953.

Prof. Iwao Ayusawa, International Christian University, Tokyo, 1955-56.

Prof. Seiichi Tobata, Tokyo University, 1955.

President Ichiro Nakayama, Hitotsubashi University, 1955.

Mr. Nyozeikan Hasegawa, journalist and writer, 1956.

Dr. Shinzo Kaji, Tokyo University, 1956.

Miss Tano Jodai, president, Women's College of Tokyo, 1956.

Dr. Shigeto Tsuru, Hitotsubashi University, 1956-57.

The Americans who have gone to Japan are:

Dr. Charles W. Cole, president, Amherst College, 1953.

Father Martin D'Arcy, Campion College, Oxford, England, 1953.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, New York, 1953.

Father George B. Ford, pastor, Corpus Christi Church, New York, N. Y., 1953.

Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review, 1953.

Shannon McCune, Colgate University, 1953-54.

Harry J. Carman, Columbia University, 1954.

Willard Thorp, Amherst College, 1955.

Algo Henderson, University of Michigan, 1956.

Ralph Turner, Yale University, 1957.

The program was made possible by gifts from John D. Rockefeller III, to Columbia University which has full responsibility for the administration of the program.

SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 1957

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice at 12:35 p. m. in room 424, Senate Office Building, Senator Roman L. Hruska, presiding.

Also present: Robert Morris, chief counsel; William A. Rusher, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, research director; and Robert C. McManus, investigations analyst.

SENATOR HRUSKA. The committee will come to order and, Judge Morris, have you any preliminary statement?

MR. MORRIS. Yes. Senator, the hearing today is an outgrowth of the hearing that we had last week when Tsuru, a Japanese national now a professor at Harvard University, testified. Mr. Tsuru was subpoenaed by the United States Senate Internal Security Subcommittee when we came into possession of certain papers which Mr. Tsuru left behind when he was repatriated in 1942. These papers cast considerable light on Communist operations in the United States which had as their object, the communization of some of our most distinguished universities. Specifically, it had to do with a publication called *Science and Society* which is a Marxist quarterly which is even now printed and circulated among our universities of the United States. For instance, at this hearing one of the papers professed to be and purported to be a memorandum which was obviously a Communist memorandum directed to the Communist faction of the board of editors of *Science and Society*.

When Mr. Tsuru testified he acknowledged that the papers were his, that he had left them behind, and he acknowledged many of the facts that were represented in the papers.

In connection with this, an important individual in connection with this particular activity was Karl H. Niebyl who is the witness here today. Mr. Niebyl has been asked to amplify on the testimony of Mr. Tsuru and the papers that Mr. Tsuru left behind. Mr. Niebyl, will you come forward, please?

SENATOR HRUSKA. Will you be sworn, please? Do you solemnly swear the testimony that you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. NIEBYL. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF KARL H. NIEBYL, ACCCOMPANIED BY DAVID REIN,
HIS ATTORNEY**

Mr. MORRIS. Will you give your name and address to the shorthand reporter?

Mr. NIEBYL. Niebyl, N-i-e-b-y-l. Karl H.

Mr. MORRIS. Karl H. Niebyl.

Mr. NIEBYL. 185 Jules Drive, New York City.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Professor Niebyl, what is your present business or profession?

Mr. NIEBYL. I feel that under the circumstances I must invoke the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. You mean you cannot tell us what your present business or profession is lest you would be surrendering your rights under the fifth amendment?

Mr. NIEBYL. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. And you will not tell us now what you are doing?

Mr. NIEBYL. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, are you now a Communist, Professor Niebyl?

Mr. NIEBYL. The answer to that is, under the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Senator, in view of the witness' reluctance to tell us what he is now doing, I would like to read to him a biographical sketch from the American Men of Science.

I will ask you point by point whether these facts are in truth correct.

Mr. REIN. David Rein, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C. I wonder if we could have the pictures taken and dispensed with, rather than have this constant interruption?

Senator HRUSKA. That would be well. We will give you gentlemen a brief time in which to get that done. We are for you and we want you to get proper photographic records but we do not want this hearing interfered with unduly.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you born on June 30, 1936, in Czechoslovakia?

Mr. NIEBYL. In Prague.

Mr. MORRIS. In Prague. Did you attend the Institute of Technology in Hanover, Germany, in 1923-24?

Mr. NIEBYL. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you attend the University of Paris, 1929-30?

Mr. NIEBYL. That is correct. May I say that the dates I would have to check but it is correct that I attended the University of Paris.

Mr. MORRIS. I am reading from the American Men of Science.

Mr. NIEBYL. I am sure that is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you attend the University of Frankfurt, Germany, in 1932?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you attend the London School of Economics 1932-34?

Mr. NIEBYL. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a fellow at Wisconsin University, 1934-35?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you obtain your doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1936?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, have you been a research assistant at the University of Wisconsin during 1935 and 1936?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you later an instructor and an assistant professor of economics at Carleton College in Minnesota?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. From 1936 to 1940. Were you later adviser on monetary and fiscal policies in the Consumer Division of the OPA from 1940 to 1941?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Associate professor of economics and chairman of the graduate department of Tulane University from 1941 to 1943?

Mr. NIEBYL. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a professor at the University of Texas in 1946?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you in Blackmountain College, North Carolina from 1946 to 1947?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you professor and chairman of a department at Champlain College, State University of New York, 1947-53?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. That is the State university?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Have you been chairman of the department of economics and business administration at Muskingum College, Ohio, 1953 to 1954?

Mr. NIEBYL. Correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Do you hold two positions at the present time, one as economic and financial consultant and partner of Economic Research Associates since 1954, and another as lecturer at the New School of Social Research, beginning in 1956, New York City?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, I noticed that in the Abraham Lincoln School catalog, that is the Abraham Lincoln School which was a Communist training school in Chicago. It is no longer in existence but was there during the war. In the 1943 catalog of the Abraham Lincoln School is listed Karl H. Niebyl as economic adviser on monetary and fiscal policies for the advisory commission to the Council of National Defense.

Now, did you have that one additional position? I will read it again. The question is, did you, as was listed in the Abraham Lincoln School catalog, were you the economic adviser on monetary and fiscal policies with the advisory commission to the Council of National Defense?

Mr. NIEBYL. In the way the question is phrased, I am afraid I must invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, did you work for the Council on National Defense at any time?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Would you tell us what you did for the Council on National Defense?

Mr. NIEBYL. May I say that that is exactly the same position that you already referred to because the Consumer Division became part of the OPA and it was only a very short while that that office was in the Council of National Defense. I advised the Committee on the Council of National Defense.

Mr. MORRIS. So you had this one position with OPA?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. And for a short time that was called the Advisory Commission to the Council on National Defense?

Mr. NIEBYL. That was called the Consumer Division in the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense.

Mr. MORRIS. I see.

Mr. NIEBYL. It is exactly the same.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, did you know a Japanese national by the name of Tsuru Shigetu?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Who was Tsuru Shigetu?

Mr. NIEBYL. To the best of my knowledge he was a student. I believe he went to Lawrence College. I met him, I believe, at the University of Wisconsin and haven't seen him, I would say, for about 20 years.

Mr. MORRIS. I see. Now, I offered to you through your attorney a memorandum that purports to be written—have you still got it, Mr. Rein?

Mr. REIN. I have it.

Mr. MORRIS. Will you look at that, please. Now that is signed by—will you read the names of the three persons signing that. Just read the names. It appears on page 12. Just read the names.

Mr. NIEBYL. Karl H. Niebyl.

Mr. MORRIS. Karl H. Niebyl.

You were then with the department of economics at Carleton College. Constance Kyle at the department of psychiatry at the University of Illinois and Alfred Z. Lowe.

Now, did you sign that memorandum?

Mr. NIEBYL. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. You will not tell us, but instead you are invoking the privilege under the fifth amendment?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Before answering that question, have you looked at the memorandum before you answer that question?

Mr. NIEBYL. Briefly, yes.

Mr. MORRIS. Briefly?

Mr. NIEBYL. Briefly.

Mr. MORRIS. Still you want to invoke your privilege under the fifth amendment?

Mr. NIEBYL. Right.

Senator HRUSKA. As a matter of fact, you were furnished with a copy of this memorandum before the hearing started?

Mr. NIEBYL. Right.

Senator HRUSKA. So you had an opportunity to look at it?

Mr. NIEBYL. Briefly.

Senator HRUSKA. Very briefly?

Mr. MORRIS. May I look at your copy?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Tsuru has acknowledged that the signature here, Alfred Z. Lowe, was a name that he, himself, used and that his name did appear on this memorandum.

To your knowledge did Constance Kyle and Alfred Z. Lowe join with you in the preparation of this memorandum?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. How much of this memorandum was written by Constance Kyle?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Claiming your privilege?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Mr. MORRIS. How much of this memorandum was written by Alfred Z. Lowe, which was the name Mr. Tsuru acknowledged was the one he used at this time?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, Senator, I do not want to labor this too much. The whole thing is in our record. It has been described as a document that is obviously the work of a student of an, an advanced student of Communist propaganda, advanced students of Communist dialectics and, as has been described to the subcommittee, is obviously a person with very important experience in the Agitprop portion of the party.

Were you a Communist at the date this memorandum was written, roughly 1937?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Had you any Communist training at the time this memorandum was prepared?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Had you attended the Chicago Workers School?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Senator HRUSKA. On what grounds?

Mr. NIEBYL. Based on the fifth amendment.

Senator HRUSKA. Does that apply to all of these refusals?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes, sir.

Senator HRUSKA. I just wanted the record to so show.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you attended the University of Berlin in 1930?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were at the London School of Economics in 1932 to 1934?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. While you were in England did you meet a man who testified before this subcommittee a few weeks ago, Frank Meyer? He was an American. It was testified he was at that time a member of the Communist Party and he had a temporary assignment in England. Now, did you, I am asking you, did you know Frank Meyer in England while you were a student at the London School of Economics?

Mr. NIEBYL. The name means nothing to me. I cannot recall.

Mr. MORRIS. You cannot recall Frank Meyer?

Mr. NIEBYL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know Frank Meyer subsequently in Chicago?

Mr. NIEBYL. I do not recognize the name.

Mr. MORRIS. He is a thin man, sharp features, dark hair, active in the Communist Party in Chicago. I mean, if he has told us that he knew you as a Communist, you will not contradict that; will you?

Mr. NIEBYL. Well, if you put the question that way, then I will refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. I am trying to be fair with you. He has told us that he knew you well in Chicago and he knew you also in England and he was then a Communist, active in students' organization work for the Communist Party and he said you were engaged in the same activity as he was.

Now, I am asking you if you will deny that, or is it your answer you just do not recall the man or are you going to claim your privilege?

Mr. NIEBYL. Well, my position is that I do not recall the man.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you active in organizing Communist students while you were in England?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. There was an organization at the time, that Mr. Meyer was engaged in, which was organizing Communist students at the various English unions. Did you participate in any work such as that while you were in England?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, were you a Communist when you went to the University of Wisconsin in 1936?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were research assistant at the University of Wisconsin in 1935 to 1936?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were instructor and professor of economics at Carleton College, Minnesota?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were adviser on monetary and fiscal policies, Consumer Division of OPA 1940-41?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Senator HRUSKA. The record will show that in each instance where the witness refuses to answer, it is made on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now were you a Communist when you were on the Advisory Commission to the Council on National Defense?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were the associate professor of economics and chairman of the graduate department, Tulane University, in the years 1941-43?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were a professor at the University of Texas in 1946?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were in Black Mountain College in North Carolina 1946 to 1947?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were professor and chairman of a department at Champlain College, State university, New York?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you at any time asked by State authorities if you had been a member of the Communist Party while working at the State university in New York?

Mr. NIEBYL. No.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist when you were chairman of the department of economics and business administration at Muskingum College in Ohio, 1953 to 1954?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a Communist carrying on your work since 1954 for the Economic Historical Association in New York City?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Were you a lecturer in the New School of Social Research beginning in 1956?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now I would like to offer you a letter from Mr. Tsuru, dated February 22, 1937, addressed to dear Karl H. Niebyl, and there he gives the makeup and the constituency of 8 Marxist study groups which, as you will see by the attendance here designated, the attendance embraced more than 100 students, some of whom obviously are professors. I ask you if you can recall having received that letter from Mr. Tsuru?

Mr. NIEBYL. Under the circumstances, I must claim the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. And you will not tell us how these groups were organized?

Mr. NIEBYL. That is right.

Mr. MORRIS. In connection with the correspondence of Mr. Tsuru there was mentioned in here with great particularity your own name, a woman named Constance Kyle, and a man named within the party who is now a professor at the University of Buffalo and these papers go on to say, and these are all in the record, that these study groups were used as a vehicle to draw people into the full organization of the Communist Party. Can you tell us whether you know, as a matter of fact, the study groups this letter addresses itself to were in the process of being drawn into the Communist Party?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, Senator, we have here in the record about 6 or 7 letters of this nature together with this memorandum. I think I can assume, Senator, in view of the witness' responses so far that he is not going to give us any of the information that we would like which obviously deals with this concentrated effort at the hands or on the part of the Communists to organize study groups and through these methods to recruit for the Communist Party in the United States.

So I suggest, in view of the witness' responses—I am not being unfair, am I?

Mr. REIN. No.

Mr. MORRIS. I think we can assume he is not going to answer the questions on these.

Senator HRUSKA. And we can assume, Mr. Niebyl and Mr. Counsel, if each of those letters were identified and referred to in similar situations as the first one and the same or similar questions asked, the same privilege would be asserted?

Mr. REIN. Speaking for the witness, I would say "Yes."

Mr. NIEBYL. I would say "Yes."

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to ask a few questions about the Economic Research, Inc.

Now, you are associated with Economic Research, Inc., are you not?

Mr. NIEBYL. I claim the privilege in view of the way the question is phrased.

Mr. MORRIS. I will try to rephrase it. Economic Research, Inc., is listed in the New York phone book 120 Broadway, New York, telephone Barkley 1-7590.

Mr. NIEBYL. I have no connection with that.

Mr. MORRIS. You have no connection. We have no way of learning except to ask you.

How about the Economic Research Association?

Mr. NIEBYL. I am invoking my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, a paid ad in the Staten Island redbook, 1956 to 1957, classification housing survey consultants, lists Karl H. Neibyl, 185 Jules Drive, telephone Gibraltar 2-4476. Now was that your listing?

Mr. NIEBYL. I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. You will not even tell us whether or not this ad which appeared in the Staten Island redbook listing you with the address that you have given the committee, Gibraltar 2-4476 was your number?

Mr. NIEBYL. I must invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator HRUSKA. Was that listing inserted by you or as a result of your efforts?

Mr. NIEBYL. I must invoke the fifth amendment.

Senator HRUSKA. Does that listing refer to you?

Mr. NIEBYL. I must refuse to answer.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, I am going to ask, for the purposes of the record, if you will tell us who your associates are in Economic Research Association? Who was associated with you in that business venture?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, will you tell us—the telephone book lists Elizabeth H. Niebyl at 185 Jules Drive in Staten Island as a housing economist. Is she your wife?

Mr. NIEBYL. I must claim the fifth amendment; the privilege of the fifth amendment as well as a husband-and-wife relationship privilege.

Senator HRUSKA. Are you married?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Senator HRUSKA. What is your wife's name?

Mr. NIEBYL. Elizabeth.

Senator HRUSKA. And where does she live?

Mr. NIEBYL. At 185 Jules Drive.

Senator HRUSKA. Is she engaged in any business or profession?

Mr. NIEBYL. I must refuse to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment and the husband-and-wife relationship.

Mr. MORRIS. Did you know a person named Sylvia Ernstein, 2040 West Division Street, Chicago?

Mr. NIEBYL. I can't place her.

Mr. MORRIS. You can't place her? Senator, I think, rather than go through a list of names here in public session, it would be better if

we arrange some meeting at some other time for this particular witness. I would like to ask, before conclusion of the hearing, Senator, that Mr. Mandel, our research director, obtain the Government file, employment file of Mr. Niebyl while he worked for the United States Government and, when we do receive it, it go into the record at this point.

Senator HRUSKA. It will be received into the record.

(The employment file of Niebyl was marked "Exhibit No. 452" and is as follows:)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
BUREAU OF DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL SERVICE

Name: Niebyl, Karl H.

Date of birth: June 30, 1906.

Authority for original appointment (Examination from which appointed or other authority—Executive Order, Law, or other exemption).

Effective date	Nature of action	Position, grade, salary, etc.
8-29-40.....	Temporary Appointment (Section 2, Rule VIII).	Senior Economist P-5 \$4,600 per annum ADVISORY COMMISSION to the COUNCIL of NATIONAL DEFENSE, Washington, D. C.
9-15-41.....	Termination of Appointment.....	Office of Price Administration, ¹ OFFICE for EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT, Washington, D. C.

¹ Funds reallocated from Council of National Defense to OEM, 2-28-41.

EXAMINATION SERVICES SECTION

EHD 4/16

EXHIBIT No. 452

OATH OF OFFICE

Prescribed by Section 1757, Revised Statutes of the United States

THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

I, Karl Heinrich Niebyl, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So HELP ME GOD.

I, further, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am not a member of the Communist party, the German Bund, or any other Communist, Nazi, or Fascist organization, and that I am not a member of any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of Government in the United States.

KARL H. NIEBYL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of September, A.D. 1940 at Washington, D. C.

[SEAL]

LAVADA M. COURT,
Notary Public.

My commission expires March 31, 1944.

Position to which appointed Temp. A., Senior Economist, P-5, \$4,600 per annum.

Date of entrance on duty August 29, 1940.

3768 SCOPE OF SOVIET ACTIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., September 3, 1941.

C. S. C. Report No. 41-1773-T

Name: Niebyl, Karl H.

Nature of Action: Termination of Appointment (without prejudice).

	From	To
Position.....	Senior Economist.....	
Grade and salary.....	P-5, \$4,600 per annum.....	
Bureau.....	Office of Price Administration.....	
Branch.....	Consumer Division.....	
Headquarters.....	Washington, D. C.....	
Departmental or field.....	Departmental.....	

Effective date: Sept. 15, 1941, c. o. b.

Remarks: Termination of temporary appointment. Because of the confidential nature of the work in this office and the unsatisfactory report of the character investigation of Mr. Niebyl.

CHAS E. MILLS, *Personnel Officer.*

THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1941.

CHIEF PERSONNEL SECTION,

The Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense (Through the Immediate Supervisor).

I hereby tender my resignation from the position of Advisor on Monetary and Fiscal Policies (Senior Economist) at a salary of \$4,600. Division Consumer to take effect at the close of business September 15, 1941.

Reason: Acceptance of position as Associate Professor of economics at Tulane University, New Orleans.

KARL H. NIEBYL.

Home Address:

At present, 2000 Connecticut Av., Apt. 707, Washington, D. C.

After September 15, Dept. of Economics, Tulane University, New Orleans.

Accepted:

FRANCES R. MONTGOMERY,
Adm. Officer—Con. Div. O. P. A.

ACADEMIC RECORD

Name: Karl H. Niebyl.

Age: 34; married; one child.

Nationality: American.

Address: 118 Winona Street, Northfield, Minnesota.

Academic Positions:

Fellow, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, 1934-1935.

Research Assistant, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, 1935-February 1936.

Instructor, Department of Economics, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota, 1936-1938.

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Carleton College, 1938-.

Degrees: Ph. D. (Economics), University of Wisconsin, 1936:

Thesis: "The Change of Function of Trade Unionism During the Epoch of Imperialism."

Diploma in Economics (M. A.), University of Frankfurt am Main, 1932.

Honors: I. S. S. Scholar, London School of Economics, London, England. Fellow, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Universities Attended: Institute of Technology, Hannover, 1923-1924; University of Paris, Paris (Honors), 1929-1930; University of Berlin, Berlin, 1930-1931; University of Frankfurt (M. A.), 1931-1932; London School of Economics, London School of Economics, London, 1932, 1933-1934; University of Wisconsin, Madison (Ph. D.), 1934-1936.

Languages: I read, write, and speak German and French; I read Spanish and Italian.

Publications:

"Modern Mathematics and Some Problems of Quantity, Quality, and Motion in Economic Analysis," *Journal of the Philosophy of Science*, New York, January 1940.

"The Need for a Concept of Value in Economic Theory," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, published by Harvard University, February 1940.

"Historijske izmjene u funkciji izvoza kapitala (Esej iz dinamicke teorije)," *Ekonomist*, Zagreb, Juli-August 1939 (Croatian).

"Surplus Population and the Present Crisis in Japan," *Current Economic Issues*, December 1937.

Also, book reviews in several economic journals.

Articles Definitely Accepted for Publication:

"A Reexamination of the Classical Theory of Inflation," *American Economic Review*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, December 1940.

"The Historical Change in the Function of Capital Export," *Economic History Review*, London, England.

"Some Historical Aspects of Mercantile Concepts of Money."

Articles Submitted for Publication:

"Equilibrium and the Quantity Concept of Money."

"Some Aspects of the Basic Assumptions of Quantitative Economics."

"An Historical Example of Qualitative Economic Change."

Papers Read:

"Population Change and Business Cycle Theory." At the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Economic Association, Des Moines, Iowa, April 19, 1940.

"The Economics of the Present War." At the University of Wisconsin, March 6, 1940.

"The Economics of Fascism." At the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Economic Association, Des Moines, April 22, 1939.

"Some Aspects of the Basic Assumptions of Quantitative Economics." At the Sixth Annual Research Conference on Economics and Statistics, of the Cowles Commission, at Colorado Springs, July 1940.

Public Lectures:

"Swedish Experiments in the Control of the Business Cycle."

"Changes in the Function of Capital Export."

"The Economics of the Mediterranean."

"Some Problems of Modern Business Cycle Theory."

Work in Progress:

"Studies in the Function of Money." This is a research project on which I have been working for the last two years. In connection with it I was awarded a grant-in-aid by the Research Committee of Carleton College for research in England, France, and Switzerland in the summer of 1938. For the summer of 1940 I was given a grant-in-aid by the Social Science Research Council to continue the project.

"Economic History—The Development of the Economic Structure of the Modern World." This work is being written upon the request of the Ronald Press. The material for a two-volume work has been assembled and will be written up after the completion of the above work.

Previous Research not destined for publication:

"A Critical-Comparative Study of English and German Trade Unionism During a Period of Economic Contraction." With Professor Harold J. Laski, London School of Economics.

"The Change from Social Welfare Policy to Industrial Democracy. An Analysis of German Trade Union Policy." With Professor A. Löwe, University of Manchester, England, formerly of the University of Frankfort am Main, Germany.

"Present Trends of Population Movements in Minnesota." "The Present Situation of Agriculture and Industry in Minnesota." Reports written for the college representative to the Minnesota Institute of Governmental Research.

"An Evaluation of the Existing Material on Acculturation with the View of Studying the Implications of the Term 'Acculturation' and Exploring New Leads for Further Investigations." For the Committee on Acculturation of the Social Science Research Council, New York.

Business Activity: I apprenticed and learned thoroughly both the steel trade and banking. I acted as a correspondent to a German bank (Darmstädter &

Nationalbank, Berlin) at the Berlin Stock Exchange. I was assistant to the director of a steel construction corporation (Steffens & Noelle, Berlin). In Paris I was foreign correspondent for an import and export house (Guttmann & Lemmle, Paris). In Berlin I acted as economic counsellor to a firm of corporation lawyers (Richard Rosendorff, Berlin).

Teaching Experiences: Principles of Economics, American Economic History, European Economic History, Development of Economic Thought, Money and Banking, Public Finance, Business Cycle Theory, Advanced Economic Theory.

Professional Societies:

National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.

British Association for the Advancement of Science.

American Economic Association.

References:

Professor Arthur R. Burnstan, Department of Economics, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota.

Professor Eugen Alstchul, School of Business Administration, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Professor Walter Morton, Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Professor T. E. Rankin, Chairman, Department of English, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota.

Professor Charles Christopher Mierow, Chairman, Department of Biography, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota.

KARL H. NIEBYL.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., July 22, 1940.

Mr. MORRIS. I have no more questions of this witness.

Senator HRUSKA. What is your business or profession, Mr. Niebyl, at present?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Senator HRUSKA. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. NIEBYL. Yes.

Senator HRUSKA. Where do you vote, what is your voting address or voting location?

Mr. NIEBYL. 185 Jules Drive. ~

Senator HRUSKA. When did you last vote as a citizen at that address?

Mr. NIEBYL. Last November.

Senator HRUSKA. And where did you vote before that?

Mr. NIEBYL. At the same address.

Senator HRUSKA. How long have you lived there?

Mr. NIEBYL. About 2 years.

Senator HRUSKA. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the fifth amendment.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you been active in any—are you active now in any Communist affairs or work?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer under the same privilege.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you been active in the past in any Communist affairs?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Senator HRUSKA. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time in the past?

Mr. NIEBYL. I refuse to answer.

Senator HRUSKA. That is all, Judge Morris.

Mr. MORRIS. There is one article here which purports to be written by the witness here today. I think just to be sure it is the article, the same one: This is in *Science and Society*, the Marxist quarterly

that our evidence indicates was a Communist magazine. Was all this in the past—

Senator HRUSKA. Did you base a question—

Mr. MORRIS. I do not think there is a question pending. I might point out that one of the items in our record among Mr. Tsuru's papers contained a statement that the board of editors of Science and Society magazine in 1937 was virtually the same as the Communist faction in the Science and Society magazine. That is a term the Communists use to stake out their representation in a particular project.

Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Niebyl, now referring to the summer 1940 issue of Science and Society magazine which on its cover page describes itself as a Marxian quarterly. It is volume IV, No. 3 and I am referring to pages 234 to 239 inclusive of that and the article on those pages is entitled "The Cynical Mr. Kane" and signed by Karl H. Niebyl. I should like to know—will you inspect that article in that issue and tell me whether or not that article was authorized by you?

Mr. NIEBYL. I must refuse to answer, claiming the protection of the fifth amendment.

Senator HRUSKA. The record will show that the witness did refer to the magazine in question and examined the pages referred to before making his answer. That will be all, Judge Morris, unless you have something further.

Mr. MORRIS. No, I have nothing further.

Senator HRUSKA. The hearing will be adjourned.

(At 1:10 p. m. the subcommittee adjourned.)

INDEX

NOTE.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee attaches no significance to the mere fact of the appearance of the names of an individual or an organization in this index.

A

	Page
Abe, Dr. Yoshishige	3757
Abraham Lincoln School	3698, 3761
Academic Record—Karl H. Niebyl	3768—3770
Addis, T.—Stanford School of Medicine; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Adler, Solomon	3696, 3750
Advisory Commission to the Council on National Defense	3698, 3762, 3764, 3767, 3768
Agitprop	3763
“Agriculture in U. S. A” by R. Bryce	3739, 3740
Aiken, Henry—Harvard; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Alber, Harry F.	3745
Alexander, J. W.—Princeton; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Alstchul, Prof. Eugen	3770
American Academy of Policy and Sociology	3751
American Economic Association	3770
American Embassy	3748
“American Imperialism” by E. H. Norman	3739—3741
American-Japan intellectual interchange program	3687, 3707, 3709, 3757 Americans who have gone to Japan
Japanese who have come to United States	3757
American League Against War and Fascism	3697, 3705, 3711, 3717, 3726
American Men of Science	3760
Ando, Jiro	3749
Anti-Duhring by Engels	3697, 3705
Anti-Imperialism League	3692, 3717, 3718, 3754
Appendix I—Intellectual interchange program	3757
Army Department Security Board	3746
ASAHI, Japan’s leading newspaper	3710
Association of Marxian Studies	3691, 3697, 3704, 3705, 3706, 3715 List of study groups
Atlantic Monthly	3715, 3717
Ayusawa, Prof. Iwao	3751

B

Ballaine, Francis—Adelphi; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Beard, Charles	3733
Berlin Stock Exchange	3770
Bernal, J. D.—University of Cambridge	3706, 3753
Bialer, Mr.	3750
Birch, Francis—Harvard; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Birdsall, Paul—Williams; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Bisson, T. A.	3755
Bittleman	3727, 3739
Bon-To-Jin, pen name of Shigeto Tsuru	3692
Borton, Dr. Hugh	3757
Boston	3688, 3691, 3695, 3754
Bowles, Gordon	3757
Bradley, Lyman R.—Brooklyn; contributor to Science and Society	3712

	Page
Brady, Robert A.—California ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Brameld-----	3726, 3737
Brameld, Theodore B.—Adelphia ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Braunthal-----	3734
Brenner, Henry-----	3755
Brewster, Dorothy—Columbia ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
British Association for the Advancement of Science-----	3770
Brookings Institution-----	3723
Brown, Harold Chapman—Stanford ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Brown, Prof. J. F., University of Kansas-----	3706
Brown, William O.—Howard ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Bryce, Robert-----	3739-3741
Bukharin-----	3731
Bunche, Ralph J.—Howard ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Burgum-----	3715, 3753
Burgum, Edwin Berry—New York ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Burnstan, Prof. Arthur R-----	3770

C

Cambridge-----	3693, 3697,
3704-3706, 3710, 3715, 3716, 3719, 3722, 3727, 3729, 3742-3744, 3752, 3753	
Cameron, Kenneth Neill—Indiana ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Canadian Legation in Tokyo-----	3743
Cannon, Walter B.—Harvard ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Capital :	
First volume of-----	3734
Second edition of-----	3728
Third volume of-----	3726, 3737, 3738
Carman, Harry J.—Columbia University-----	3757
Carmichael, Dr. Oliver, former president of University of California-----	3757
Carter, Mr-----	3746
Cazden, Norman—Harvard and Illinois ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Chao-Ting, Chi-----	3746, 3747
Chicago, Ill-----	3693-3695, 3697, 3698, 3705, 3706, 3715,
3718, 3719, 3721, 3726-3729, 3735, 3736, 3738, 3761, 3763, 3764, 3766	
Chicago Workers School-----	3763
China-----	3692, 3693, 3695, 3699, 3700, 3710, 3718, 3746
Clark, Grover-----	3723
Cobb, H. V.—Carleton ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Cohen, Joseph W.—Colorado ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Cohen, Theodore-----	3750
Cole, Dr. Charles W., president of Amherst College-----	3757
Colleges and universities :	
Blackmountain College, North Carolina-----	3761, 3764
Carleton College, Minnesota-----	3735, 3698, 3724, 3761, 3762, 3764, 3768, 3770
Champlain College, State University of New York-----	3761, 3764
Columbia University-----	3688, 3702, 3757
Harvard University-----	3687-3691,
3693, 3694, 3702, 3704, 3709, 3740-3742, 3744, 3759	
Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo-----	3687, 3709
Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis-----	3688, 3693, 3762
Muskingum College, Ohio-----	3761, 3765
Northwestern University-----	3730
Tokyo University-----	3757
Tulane University-----	3698, 3761, 3764, 3768
University of Akron-----	3706
University of Berlin-----	3698, 3763, 3768
University of Buffalo-----	3765
University of Chicago-----	3693, 3695, 3724, 3728, 3730, 3752, 3753
University of Frankfurt, Germany-----	3698, 3760, 3768
University of Illinois-----	3706, 3774, 3762
University of London-----	3698, 3706
University of Michigan-----	3706
University of Minnesota-----	3729, 3731, 3770
University of New York (State)-----	3761, 3764, 3765

	Page
Colleges and universities—Continued	
University of Oklahoma	3706
University of Paris	3698, 3760, 3768
University of Texas	3761, 3764
University of Wisconsin	3693, 3698, 3736, 3760–3762, 3764, 3768, 3770
Communist (book)	3727
Communist/s	3691–3695, 3698, 3704, 3710, 3711, 3714, 3718, 3724, 3749, 3754, 3756, 3759, 3760, 3763–3765, 3767, 3770, 3771
American	3746
Chinese	3746, 3747
Japanese	3710
Polish	3750
Communist Party	3691–3693, 3695, 3696, 3702–3704, 3710, 3713, 3716–3718, 3724, 3736, 3738, 3750, 3763–3765, 3767, 3770
Chicago	3764
Japanese	3692
United States	3765
Constantino, Anthony	3755
Constitution	3701
Consumer Division, OPA	3761, 3762, 3764, 3768
Cookson, John	3718, 3731, 3752
Corey	3697, 3705, 3727
Council of National Defense	3761, 3762
Court, Lavada M., notary public	3767
Cousins, Norman, editor of Saturday Review	3757
Cox, Oliver O.—Tuskegee; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Curti, Dr. Merle, University of Wisconsin	3757
Cutler, Addison T.—Fisk; contributor to Science and Society	3712
"Cynical Mr. Kane, The," article in Science and Society, by Karl H. Niebyl	3771
Czechoslovakia	3760

D

Darbin	3722
D'Arcy, Father Martin	3757
Darmstädter & Nationalbank, Berlin (German bank)	3770
Darrell	3722
David, Henry—Queens; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Davis, Arthur K.—Union; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Davis, Horace B.—Simmons; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Davis, Kingsley—Pennsylvania State; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Davis, Richard G.	3691
DeBarry, Prof. Wm. T.—Columbia University	3757
Decline of American Capitalism, The, by Corey	3697, 3705
Difflie, Bailey W.—City College of New York; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Dobb, Maurice, famous economist in England	3696
Doob, Joseph	3706
Dotterer, Ray H.—Pennsylvania State; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Douglas, Wallace W.—Northwestern; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Dunbar, Carl O.—Yale; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Dunham, Barrows—Temple; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Dunn, Dr. Frederick S.—Princeton University	3757
Dunn, Leslie C.—Columbia; contributor to Science and Society	3712

E

Economic Historical Association, New York City	3765
Economic Journal	3722
Economic Research Associates	3761, 3766
Economic Research, Inc.	3766
120 Broadway, New York	3766
Telephone Barkley 1-7590	3766
Edel, Abraham—City College of New York; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Editor Review and Forecast, publication	3698
Engels	3697, 3705, 3729, 3731, 3734
England	3696, 3714, 3763, 3764

	Page
Erdman, David V.—Minnesota ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Ernstein, Sylvia-----	3766
Ewen, Frederic—Brooklyn ; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Exhibit No. 442—Letter to W. T. Parry from Shigeto Tsuru, dated August 31, 1936-----	3704-3706
Exhibit No. 443—Letter to Tsuru from Parry, dated September 6, 1936, re Science and Society-----	3706-3707
Exhibit No. 444—List of contributors to Science and Society-----	3712-3713
Exhibit No. 445—1946 issue of Science and Society (in subcommittee files)-----	3714
Exhibit No. 445-A—1956 issue of Science and Society (in subcommittee files)-----	3714
Exhibit No. 445-B—1956 issue of Science and Society (in subcommittee files)-----	3714
Exhibit No. 446—Letter to Niebyl from Tsuru, dated February 22, 1937-----	3715-
	3716
Exhibit No. 447—Letter to Niebyl from Tsuru, dated December 14, 1936-----	3718-
	3720
Exhibit No. 448—Letter to Constance Kyle from Tsuru, dated April 9, 1937-----	3720, 3723
Exhibit No. 448-A—Letter to Tsuru from Kyle, dated April 14, 1937-----	3721
Exhibit No. 449—Letter to Niebyl from Tsuru, dated January 31, 1937-----	3721-3723
Exhibit No. 450—Memorandum addressed to editors of Science and Society signed by Kyle, Niebyl, and Lowe (Tsuru)-----	3725-3735
Exhibit No. 451—Letter to Niebyl from Tsuru, dated May 9, 1937-----	3740
Exhibit No. 452—Employment file of Karl H. Niebyl, includes oath of office-----	3767

F

Fairchild, Henry Pratt—New York, contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Farley, Miriam-----	3755
Farmer-Labor Party-----	3739, 3740
Farm(er) Labor Progressive Federation-----	3697, 3705
Fascists-----	3695, 3767
FBI-----	3741
Feuer, Lewis S.—City College of New York; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Field, Fred-----	3746
Fifth amendment-----	3691, 3713, 3714, 3760-3766, 3770, 3771
Fitzgerald, James-----	3755
Ford, Father George B-----	3757
Fox, Ralph-----	3723
Frankfurt, Germany-----	3760
Franklin, Mitchell—Tulane; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Frazier, E. Franklin—Howard; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Freeman, Frank S.—Cornell; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713

G

German Bund-----	3767
Germany-----	3698
Gertrude-----	3715, 3720, 3723
Gilbert, G. M.—Princeton; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Gilkes, Lillian—New York; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Ginger, Ray—Western Reserve and Harvard; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Glover, Charles, attorney for Shigeto Tsuru-----	3687
Goodrich, Prof. Carrington, Columbia University-----	3757
Gottschalk, Hans—Iowa; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Gouldner, Alvin W.—Buffalo; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Government:	
Canadian-----	3741, 3744
Japanese-----	3701, 3747, 3750, 3751
Polish-----	3750
United Kingdom-----	3700
United States-----	3701, 3710, 3711, 3744, 3748

	Page
Great Britain-----	3706
<i>Gripsholm</i> , boat on which Tsuru repatriated-----	3689, 3709, 3710, 3747
Guide to Marxian Studies, a classification of contents-----	3715,
	3719, 3722, 3732, 3719-3720
Gundlach, Ralph H.—Washington (State); contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Guthrie, Elton P.—Washington (State); contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Guttmann & Lemmlé, Paris (import and export house)-----	3770

H

Halperin, Israel-----	3744, 3745
Hanover, Germany-----	3760, 3768
Harap, Louis—Harvard; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712,
	3715, 3722, 3752
Hartung, Frank E.—Wayne; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Hathaway, Marion—Pittsburgh; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Hegel-----	3723
Henderson, Algo, University of Michigan-----	3757
Herman (Ramras)-----	3718
Herzog, George—Columbia; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Hicks-----	3722
Hicks, Granville—Harvard; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Hiss, Alger-----	3741
Hitler-----	3698
Hogben-----	3722
Holland, William-----	3746
Holmes, Eugene C.—Howard; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Hornstein, Lillian Herlands—New York; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
House Un-American Activities Committee-----	3691
Howard, Kenneth-----	3753
Hruska, Senator Roman L.-----	3759
Huberman, Leo—Columbia; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Hughes, Charles—Hunter; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Hunter, Louis C.—American; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712

I

Ichikawa, Miss Fusae-----	3757
Ideology and Utopia, by Manheim-----	3729
Imamura, Dr. Arao-----	3757
India-----	3750
Infeld, Leopold—Toronto; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Inlow, E. Burke—Princeton; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR)-----	3747, 3748, 3754, 3755
Japanese Council of-----	3746
Lucknow conference-----	3747
Institute of Technology, Hanover, Germany-----	3760, 3768
International Communist Relief Corps, part of the overall MOPR—Soviet Relief Organization-----	3692
International Economic Service, Ltd-----	3745
International House-----	3689, 3690
International Student Institute-----	3742, 3743

J

Jaffe, Phillip-----	3754
Japan-----	3692,
3693, 3696, 3700, 3701, 3710, 3717, 3740, 3742-3746, 3748, 3750, 3751, 3754, 3757	3757
Japan Anti-War League-----	3754
Japanese Army-----	3700
Japanese Emancipation League-----	3755
Japanese invasion of China-----	3695, 3699
Jenner, Senator Wm. E-----	3687
Jodai, Miss Tano-----	3757
Johnston, Senator Olin D-----	3687
Journal of American Statistical Association-----	3722

INDEX

K

	Page
Kaiso	3751
Kaji, Dr. Shinzo	3757
Kameyama, Prof. Naoto	3757
Katayama, Premier	3710
Kazakevich, Vladimir D.—Columbia; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Keeney, Phillip O	3750
Keynes, John M	3697, 3722, 3735
Kihara, Dr. Hitoshi	3757
Killem, James	3756
Killen	3756
Kiroshi, Joja	3755
Koichi, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal	3689
Koizumi, Dr. Shinzo	3757
Korb, Mr	3752
Korb's group in Cambridge	3705
Krechevsky, I.—University of Chicago	3706
Kresh, Joseph—Brooklyn and City College of New York; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Kuznets	3723
Kyle, Constance (Connie)	3697, 3705, 3706, 3714-3716,
	3718, 3720, 3721, 3724, 3729, 3735, 3736, 3751, 3754, 3762, 3763, 3765

L

Lange, Oscar (Polish Communist official)	3719, 3722, 3750
Larkin, Oliver—Smith: contributor to Science and Society	3712
Laski	3722, 3733
Laski, Prof. Harold J	3769
Lectures of Karl H. Niebyl	3769
Left Book Club in England	3714, 3716
Left News, The	3723
Lenin	3715, 3727, 3729, 3731
Leontief, Prof.	3716, 3722
Letter to Parry from Tsuru, dated August 31, 1936—Exhibit No. 442	3689,
	3690, 3704-3706, 3717, 3720
Letter to Tsuru from Parry, dated September 6, 1936—Exhibit No. 443	3698,
	3706-3707
Letter to Niebyl from Tsuru, dated February 22, 1937—Exhibit No. 446	3714,
	3715-3716, 3717, 3723, 3765
Levinson, Norman—Massachusetts Institute of Technology; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Levy, H.—University of London	3706
Lewis, John	3723
Liberty League	3730
Lind, L. R.—Kansas; contributor to Science and Society	3713
London School of Economics (London, England)	3698, 3760, 3763, 3768
Lowe, Alfred Z. (name used by Shigeto Tsuru); contributor to Science and Society	3769
	3691, 3712, 3724, 3729, 3732, 3735, 3738, 3762, 3763, 3769
Lumpkin, Katharine De Pre—Smith; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Lunning, Mr	3752
Lunning's group	3705

M

MacArthur, General	3710, 3739
MacLaulin, G. C	3723
MacLeod, Robert B.—Cornell; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Madison, Wisconsin	3693, 3695, 3697, 3705, 3718, 3729, 3731, 3752
Maeda, Tamon	3757
Maier, N. R. F.—University of Michigan	3706
Manchuria	3692
Mandel, Benjamin	3687, 3709, 3759
Mandel, Vernard—Pennsylvania; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Mandel, William—Stanford; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Manheim	3729
Manifesto	3726, 3737
Mark, Irving—Brooklyn; contributor to Science and Society	3712

INDEX

VII

	Page
Marquat, General	3743
Marshall	3722
Marx, Karl	3691, 3697, 3704, 3705, 3722, 3723, 3728, 3729, 3731, 3734, 3741
Marx-Engels Archiv	3733
"Marxian Methodology in Social Sciences," by Tsuru	3739, 3740
Marxism	3696, 3703, 3719, 3726, 3730, 3752
Marxism and Modern Thought	3731
Marxist Study Clubs	3730, 3765
Marxist Quarterly, The	3728, 3729, 3735
Mason, Professor	3716
Massachusetts	3715, 3716, 3718
Mather, Kirtley F.—Harvard; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Matsukata, Saburo	3747, 3757
Matsumoto, Mr.	3747
Matsumoto, Shigeharu	3757
Matsuo, Mr.	3747, 3748
Matueros	3755
May, Kenneth—Carleton; contributor to Science and Society	3713
McCune, Shannon	3757
McGill	3726, 3729, 3733, 3737
McGill, V. J.—Hunter; contributor to Science and Society	3712
McManus, Robert C.	3759
Mead, Lawrence	3743
Menefee, Selden C.—National; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Merton, Robert K.—Harvard; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Meyer, Frank	3763, 3764
Mierow, Prof. Charles Christopher	3770
Mills, Chas. E.	3768
Minnesota	3761, 3764
Mins, H. F.	3706, 3707, 3714, 3716, 3721
Mises. (<i>See</i> von Mises.)	
Mitchell, Broadus—Johns Hopkins; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Montagu, M. F. Ashley—Hahnemann Medical; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Montgomery, Frances R.	3768
Monthly Review Press	3696
Moore, Professor (Columbia University)	3757
MOPR—Soviet Relief Organization	3692
Morais, Herbert M.—Brooklyn; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Morris, Robert	3687, 3709, 3759
Morrison, Philip—Cornell; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Morton, Prof. Walter	3770
Moscow	3751

N

Nagayo, Yoshiro	3757
Nagel, Ernest	3733
Nakayama, President Ichiro, Hitotsubashi University	3757
Nathan, Otto—New York; contributor to Science and Society	3713
"National Income and Its Distribution Among Different Classes," by L. Tarshis	3739, 3740
National Bureau of Economic Research, New York	3770
Nazi	3767
Nettels, Curtis P.—Wisconsin, contributor to Science and Society	3712
New School of Social Research	3761, 3765
New Statesman and Nation, The	3722
New York	3715, 3716, 3718, 3719, 3721, 3727-3729, 3735, 3760, 3761
Niebyl, Elizabeth H., wife of Karl H.	3766
Niebyl, Karl Heinrich (K. H. N.)	3698, 3704, 3706, 3715, 3717, 3718, 3720, 3721, 3724, 3729, 3733, 3735, 3736, 3738-3740, 3751, 3753, 3759
Niebyl, Karl H.—Carleton; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Testimony of Karl H. Niebyl	3760-3771
185 Jules Drive, New York City	3760, 3770
Fifth amendment re employment	3760, 3770
Fifth amendment re Communist Party	3760, 3764, 3770

	Page
Niebyl, Karl H.—Carleton ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> —Continued	
Attorney, David Rein, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.	3760
Born June 30, 1936, in Prague	3760
1923–24, attended Institute of Technology, Hanover, Germany	3760
1929–30, attended University of Paris	3760
1932, attended University of Frankfurt, Germany	3760
1932–34, attended London School of Economics	3760
1936, Ph. D. from University of Wisconsin	3760–3761
1935–36, research assistant at University of Wisconsin	3761
1936–40, instructor at Carleton College, Minnesota	3761
1940–41, Consumer Division, OPA	3761
1941–43, associate professor, Tulane University	3761
1946, professor, University of Texas	3761
1946–47, Blackmountain College, North Carolina	3761
1947–53, Champlain College, State University of New York	3761
1953–54, Muskingum College, Ohio	3761
Since 1954, with Economic Research Associates	3761
1956, lecturer at New School of Social Research, New York City	3761
Worked for Council on National Defense	3761
Wife, Elizabeth	3766
Fifth amendment re wife's business or profession	3766
Employment file	3767, 3768
Academic record	3768–3770
Languages	3769
Publications	3769
Public lectures	3769
Business activity	3769
Professional societies	3770
References	3770
Ninth Party Convention	3727, 3738
Norman, E. H.	3739–3744
North Carolina	3761, 3764
Northfield, Minn.	3768, 3770
Nye	3741
Nye, Russell B.—Michigan State ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3713

O

Oath of office	3767
Obermeyer, Charles—Columbia ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3712
Odegard, Prof. Peter—University of California	3757
Ohio	3761, 3765
Olson, Miss, secretary to Mins.	3714, 3716, 3721
On Reproduction Schemes, appendix written for Sweezy's book by Tsuru	3696
OPA, Consumer Division	3761, 3762, 3764, 3768
OPA, Office for Emergency Management	3767, 3768
Orchard, Prof. John—Columbia University	3757
Otis, Brooks—Hobard ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3712

P

Pareto	3734
Parry, William T.—Buffalo University	3689,
3699, 3704, 3707, 3714–3716, 3719–3724, 3736, 3738, 3740, 3752, 3754	
Contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3713
Instructor of philosophy at Harvard	3690
Identified by Richard Davis as Communist	3691
Paskoff, Benjamin—City College of New York ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3712
Patel, Surendra J.—Pennsylvania ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3713
Patterson, Ernest F.—Alabama ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3713
"Peculiarities of Capitalist Accumulation in U. S." by P. Sweezy	3739, 3740
Petty, William	3723
Phillips, Herbert J.—Washington (State) ; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i>	3712
Poland	3750
Prague	3733, 3760
Publications of Karl H. Niebyl	3769

Q	Page
Quesnay-----	3697
R	
Raj, Wataru-----	3754
Ramras, Herman-----	3731, 3752
Ramsay-----	3722
Rankin, Prof. T. E-----	3770
Reade, Leslie—New York; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Rein, David, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C., attorney for Karl H. Niebyl-----	3760
Reinhold, Meyer—Brooklyn; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3713
Reischauer, Dr. Edwin; professor at Harvard-----	3757
Reiss, Bernard F.—Brooklyn; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3713
Review of Economic Studies on the Economic Theory of Socialism, The-----	3719, 3722
Richard Rosendorff, Berlin (firm of corporation lawyers)-----	3770
Riess, Ernst—Hunter; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3713
Roberts, Leo-----	3723, 3752
Rockefeller, John D. III-----	3757
Roosevelt, Mrs. Eleanor-----	3757
Rosenfeld, Mark Nathan-----	3749
Ross, Emerson-----	3749, 3755
Roth, Andrew-----	3754
Rusher, William A-----	3687, 3709, 3759
Ryan, Prof. Frederick L.—University of Oklahoma-----	3706
S	
Saionji, Mr-----	3748
Sandow, Alexander—New York; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Sargent, S. Stanfield—Columbia; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Saturday Review-----	3757
Sazo, Nozaka (known as Susumu Okano)-----	3755
SCAP-----	3709, 3739, 3743, 3745, 3747, 3749, 3750, 3755, 3756
Schlauch, Margaret—New York; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Schuman-----	3723
Schumpeter-----	3722
Science and Society (S & S). Communist magazine-----	3691,
3693, 3699, 3702, 3703, 3706, 3710, 3711, 3713–3731, 3736–3838, 3740,	
3753, 3754, 3759, 3770, 3771.	
Science and Society Club-----	3715, 3718, 3719
Second World War-----	3700
Selsam, Howard—Brooklyn; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Senki, national organization of the Japanese Communist Party-----	3692
Seventh World Congress-----	3727, 3737, 3738
Sherman, G. W.—Montana State; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3713
Shibata, Prof. and Mrs. Kei-----	3736
Shiga, Yoshio-----	3755
Shlakman, Vera—Queens; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3713
Shou Shan Pu—Carleton; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3713
Sillen, Sam-----	3729, 3735
Contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Slochower, Harry—Brooklyn; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Snyder, Alice D.—Vassar; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Sorge espionage case-----	3748
Sourwine, J. G-----	3709
Soviet-----	3700
Soviet Union-----	3727, 3738, 3751
S & S. (<i>See</i> <i>Science and Society</i> .)-----	
Stager, Ross, University of Akron-----	3706
Stalin-----	3727, 3734, 3738
State Department-----	3689, 3742
Statens Island redbook-----	3766
Steffens & Noelle, Berlin (steel construction corporation)-----	3770
Steinmetz, Harry C.—San Diego State; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Stern, Bernhard J.—Columbia; contributor to <i>Science and Society</i> -----	3712
Strachey-----	3735

	Page
Struik, D. J.	3716, 3726, 3734, 3735, 3737, 3754
Massachusetts Institute of Technology; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Swadish, Morris—City College of New York; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Sweezy, Alan	3716, 3722
Williams College; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Sweezy, Paul M.	3696, 3716, 3719, 3735, 3739-3741
Harvard; contributor to Science and Society	3712
T	
Takagi, Dr. Yasaka	3757
Takahashi, Prof. Masao	3749
Takeda, Miss Kiyoko	3757
Tarnopol, Lester—Kentucky; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Tarshis, L.	3739-3741, 3743
Taussig	3722
Teachings of Karl Marx, by Lenin	3715
Theory of Capitalist Development, by Paul M. Sweezy	3696
Thorp, Willard—Amherst College	3757
Thorpe, General	3743
Time magazine	3748
Tobata, Prof. Seiichi	3757
Tokuda Kyuichi	3755
Tokyo	3709, 3743, 3745, 3747, 3748
Trinkaus, Charles E., Jr.—Sarah Lawrence; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Trotskyists, Trotskyites	3714, 3716, 3728, 3754
Tsuji, Mrs. Matsu	3757
Tsuru, Shigeto	3759, 3762, 3765
Testimony of	3687-3757
18-A Forest Street, Cambridge 40, Mass.	3687
Professor of economics at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo	3687
Visiting lecturer at Harvard University	3687
Born in Tokyo, Japan	3688
Married Masako Wada	3689
Used name of Alfred Z. Lowe	3691, 3724, 3729, 3732, 3735, 3738
Pen name of Bon-To-Jin	3692
Vice Minister of Economic Stabilization	3710
Charles Glover, attorney	3687
Broadcast on Voice of America	3687
Turnage, William T.	3756
Turner, Ralph, Yale University	3757
U	
United Nations Resolution on Genocide	3700
United States	3688, 3689, 3692, 3693, 3696, 3700, 3701,
	3703, 3704, 3709-3711, 3730, 3732, 3733, 3737, 3746, 3747, 3757
United Workers Party in Poland	3750
University. (<i>See</i> colleges and universities.)	
Unter dem Banner des Marxismus	3727
V	
van Cedlen	3734
Varga	3738
Venable, Vernon—Vassar; contributor to Science and Society	3712
Voice of America	3687, 3688, 3701, 3707
von Mises	3719, 3722
W	
Wada, Masako (wife of Shigeto Tsuru)	3689
Niece of Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, Koichi	3689
Walton, Eda Lou—New York; contributor to Science and Society	3713
Wataru, Raj	3754

	Page
Webb, Sidney and Beatrice-----	3722, 3753
Weisner, Louis—Hunter; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Welch, Edward Christy-----	3755, 3756
Williams, William Appleman—Oregon; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Winspear, A. D.—Wisconsin; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Wirtschafts-rechnung by Mises-----	3719
Wolfard, John A.—Montana State; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Worker's School-----	3693-
3695, 3705, 3706, 3717, 3721, 3726, 3727, 3730, 3731, 3737, 3738	

Y

YCL. (<i>See</i> Young Communist League.)	
Yellen, Samuel—Indiana; contributor to Science and Society-----	3712
Yoshida, Shigeru-----	3749
Young, Alfred—Wesleyan; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
Young Communist League (YCL)-----	3692, 3695-3697, 3705, 3711, 3718,
	3727, 3730, 3738

Z

Zagorin, Perez—Amherst; contributor to Science and Society-----	3713
---	------

○

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05442 1712

